THE LIBRARIES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON,

IN

EXPLANATION

OF

SOME STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN A LETTER

BY THE

REV. W. DODSWORTH.

BY THE REV.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW; CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH;
LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

SEVENTH EDITION.

Oxford:

JOHN HENRY PARKER,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

AND SOLD BY

RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

1851.

COL.COLL. LIBRARY OXON

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

Bridl Stox
93742
P974

NOTICE.

In the following pages, I have often used the tone of defence, of meeting "objections," &c. I would here say that in this, I referred solely to popular objections and criticisms, and in no way to the friend who wrote that statement as to my teaching, and who, I believe, understood it in a different sense from that in which (I am persuaded) it has been popularly misunderstood. I wished to take the statement simply as it has been brought against me in tracts, (circulated in order to inflame people's minds against me,) or in newspapers, or on platforms,—I wished, entirely forgetting every thing besides, except the desire in no way to pain the writer, to treat it as a statement about myself which I was called upon to explain by the use which had been so extensively made of it, the popular misunderstandings (as I was convinced) about it, and the fact that the Bishop, to whom I have addressed my answer, had thought it necessary to allude to part of it in blame.

I add this, lest I should be the occasion that any should

21128

misunderstand Mr. Dodsworth. For all these misunderstandings are in themselves to be avoided if possible, and are a heavy aggravation of all our common ills. I understand that he wrote that statement about my teaching, as objecting not to it, but to the line which I felt it right to take, when the decision of the Privy Council burst upon us, and which he thought inconsistent with my former teaching.

2*nd Week in Epiphany*, 1851.

Mr. Dodsworth has now thought it necessary to publish a statement in vindication of that which he originally made as to my teaching. Until I shall have time to put together what I have to say upon it, I must request the reader to take my own summary of what I have taught or done on these subjects. (See below, p. 175—180, and the additional note, p. 100, and on confession, p. 13—16).—Ed. 2.

5*th Sunday after Epiphany*, 1851.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Receiving confessions, summary 2

I. "Sacrament of penance" 4

Summary of former teaching; two Great Sacraments... *ib.*

Other "signs of inward grace" taught in the homilies and later writers *ib.*—11

"Auricular confession" not used, as being a technical expression, used currently of compulsory confession 12

Summary, latitude allowed on 13

Authorities; voluntary confession no encroachment on liberty..... 17—19

II. "Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, as applicatory of the One Sacrifice of the Cross" 20

Propitiatory used in two senses: one, accepted; the other, rejected *ib.*

Commemorative Sacrifice in Holy Scripture..... 22

and the Primitive Church..... *ib.*

Applicatory of the One Sacrifice 23

Authorities in the English Church.....27—38

The "Real Presence" 39

III. "Spiritual" opposed to "carnal" *ib.*

"Faith" the mean of "*receiving*" *ib.*

"Spiritually" opposed to what is *only* sacramental 41

The Sacrament, and the substance of the Sacrament ... *ib.*

The wicked eat not the Body of Christ, explained *ib.*

PAGE

"Eat" in St. John, to "eat beneficially" 43
Summary 44
"Under the form of bread and wine," words of the homilies 49
Transubstantiation denied, in the sense of a physical change *ib.*
Adoration of our Lord truly present 51
Rubric at the end of Communion Service explained ... *ib.*
Our Lord's Body locally in Heaven, sacramentally on the Altar 52
Authorities in the later English Church 54
IV. Adaptation of Roman Catholic books 57
Earlier adaptations 59—69
Objects in my adaptations 70—77
V. "Rosaries," how commonly understood 78
Repetition of the same prayer often useful *ib.*
Repetition of the Lord's Prayer 79
Our Lord's example 81
Repetition founded in nature *ib.*
Repetition in the Psalms *ib.*—86
Repetition in sacred music 86—88
Rules not in a bad sense artificial 88
Rules occur in the deepest parts of Holy Scripture ... 89—91
Use of numbers in Holy Scripture 92
Secret preparations in the Old Testament for the fuller revelation of the Trinity 93
Three-fold repetitions in the Prayer Book 95
Repetition of the Lord's Prayer not necessarily mechanical 97
"Rosaries" in the "Paradise" Devotions to the Holy Trinity, or to our Lord *ib.*
Instance and object of this structure of devotions ... 98, 99
Actual "rosary" a thing "indifferent" 99
Devotions, except to God, discouraged 100—103
Probable misapprehension as to "crucifixes" 104
No difference in principle between pictures of the Crucifixion and the Crucifix rightly used 105
Worship of images alone forbidden 106
Use of pictures of the Crucifixion in suffering 107
All historical pictures of our Lord the same in principle 108

PAGE

VI. "Special devotions to our Lord, *e. g.* to His Five Wounds" 110
The Wounds of our Lord foretold in Ps. xxii.; its character 111
Mental contemplation of our Lord on the Cross *ib.*
Humanity of our Lord with His Divinity adored together..... 113—116
Dean Jackson on the words "the Blood of God"...116—120
The shedding of our Lord's Blood specially prefigured as atoning 120, 121
Dwelt upon in the New Testament 121, 122
It flowed from those Wounds 123
The "three witnesses" on earth *ib.*
The seven sheddings of our Lord's Blood 125
Reverence and love of the Wounds of our Lord natural..... *ib.*—127
Language of St. Bernard..... 127—129
Various devotions suited to various minds..... 130
Devotions bearing on our Lord's Wounds in popular hymns 131
Common principle of these devotions 136
These devotions a bond of union of different schools ... 137
Use of the number 7 141
Our Litany pleads sheddings of His blood *ib.*
Nature of these devotions 142
Use of the right and left in Holy Scripture 143
These devotions not wrongly mystical: free to be used or refused; not to be judged of without being used *ib.*
VII. Our "incorporation into Christ"..... 145
The word "inebriated" adopted from the Fathers *ib.*
Correspondence between the symbol and the thing signified in Holy Scripture 146
Type of seed-corn, bread, in the Old Testament ... *ib.*—149
Bread and wine in the Old Testament as sources of strength and gladness 149—155
"Inebriation" expressive of Christian joy 155
Scriptural use of the word "inebriate" *ib.*
or "drink largely" 156
Joy through wine, figure of holy joy 158
"Inebriation," "forgetfulness of things earthly in heavenly joy"..... 60

PAGE

The word points to some special gift in the Cup 161
Special grace of the cup acknowledged by some later Roman writers *ib.*—164
VIII. "Counsels of perfection" not technically recommended 165
In "counsels" there is choice; in "commands" none... *ib.*
Cautions by St. Augustine and others..... 167
Bishop Taylor on counsels and precepts 168—170
Statements of the writer in "Letter to the Bishop of Oxford 170
Need of "Colleges of Clergy" and "sisters of mercy" to remedy the Heathenism of great towns ... 174, 175
Explanation on this 175
Summary 176—181
Aims of the writer..... 182
Leading causes of secessions to Rome 188
The remedy 191

A LETTER,

&c.

My dear Lord,

I have already mentioned publicly why I delayed to explain a statement of Mr. Dodsworth with regard to my teaching and practice, which has been commented upon very extensively, and in a spirit of much bitterness.

I had wished, also, if I entered upon it at all, to dwell with some fulness upon the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in order the rather to explain the statement which bears upon it. But the use which has been made of your Lordship's observations by the Prime Minister of the Crown—in order, I must think, to turn upon a body of Clergy, opposed to his avowed wish to liberalize the Church, the unpopularity of a measure which his own acts had certainly favoured, and the fever which his letter at once produced and is still producing in the country against Clergymen who are quietly discharging their duty in their parishes, seem to make it incumbent upon me at once to render to your Lordship a brief explanation of those statements.

Without further detaining your Lordship, I will set down the statements of Mr. Dodsworth, and offer a brief explanation of each.

A few additions to this Letter are enclosed in brackets.

I. "By your [my] constant and common practice of administering the sacrament of penance; by encouraging every where, if not enjoining, auricular confession; and giving special priestly absolution."

What my practice has been, I have already explained in outline[1]. I cannot, as I said, pretend to recollect all which I had done or said in twelve years. But I do mean that I have desired honestly to carry out the principles and mind of the Church of England.

My desire has been simply to exercise, in obedience to the Church, "the office and work of a Priest, committed unto" me "by the Imposition of" the Bishop's "hands," for the relief of those souls who come to me for that end. I, in common with all the Presbyters whom I know, fully believed that the Church gave power to her children, to go to any priest they had confidence in, in order to "open their griefs" for "the benefit of absolution." No doubt was ever raised upon it, until very lately (and then, I am satisfied, wholly without foundation), nor had I ever the slightest doubt. I did not apply to your Lordship, simply because I had no doubt which could occasion me to do so. Our Prayer Book places no limitation. It says that it is *requisite* for people to come to Holy Communion with a quiet conscience, and, if they need it, suggests this mode of quieting it. I am not aware that any Divine or Bishop in our Church, since the Reformation, has excepted against any thing, except making confession compulsory. The Divines whose writings on this subject I have observed, seem to me to lay especial stress on "comfort" as one object of it. They followed herein, doubtless, the language of the Prayer Book, which speaks especially of "comfort," and of "quieting the conscience," and of "avoiding scruple." They had

[1] Letter to Mr. Richards, p. 134—136. Postscript, p. 265—293.

special regard for tender consciences. When the public discipline of the Church could not be restored, as the reformers wished, and it was taught that all sin might be forgiven (as, doubtless, God does forgive it) on true, loving contrition of heart, and confession to God Alone, it was almost natural that "comfort" should be selected, as being a prominent ground for the use of confession. But this being so, then it would seem most contrary to the spirit both of the English Church and her leading Divines, to deny the privilege of confession, or "opening the griefs for the benefit of absolution" to any one who for his own peace and well-being earnestly desires it. This, I am sure, your Lordship would not, since you quote Archbishop Sharpe, who says that Protestant Churches "*exhort* men to it as a thing highly convenient *in many cases*," and that "*in all cases* no Protestant who understands his religion, is against private confession." The "comfort" of Confession, however, depends entirely on the reality of the Absolution. Whence Archbishop Sharpe concludes, "and lastly upon the full examination of his state and his judgment thereupon, to give him the absolution of the Church."

I have already explained that, for the most part, I have been simply passive in this matter. I have not preached upon the subject, except before the University, eight years after persons had first come to me to open their griefs. I have been thankful to minister to distress or anxiety whenever it has come to me. To myself, also, it has been a comfort to be thus employed (as I trust) by our Lord, to bind up the broken-hearted. I have been thankful to have been thus occasioned to exercise a pastoral office, instead of being confined to studies or teaching mainly intellectual. But I have not (as I said) "*enjoined* confession;" I have "encouraged" it mainly, by readily receiving those who applied to me by virtue of the direction of the Church. I have very rarely recommended it to individuals; and then, as a single act, on the ground of special circumstances of the case. But your Lordship's published statement far more than covers any thing which I have done, when you say, "It seems

to me—that men are not to be exhorted, or even invited to perform it, except in the specific instances for which provision is made in the offices of the Church."

But having already spoken of this more fully in my recent Postscript, I will now only explain two expressions upon which your Lordship has observed, "the *Sacrament* of penance," and "*auricular* confession."

I stated fully, twelve years ago in my letter to the then Bishop of Oxford[2], and subsequently in that to Dr. Jelf[3], that the language of the Church of England on the Sacraments, seemed to me to imply these two things: 1. That she, with ancient fathers, distinguished from every thing else, two great Sacraments of the Gospel, those Sacraments "whereby," in the language of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, "the Church consists," the two Sacraments which flowed from our Blessed Lord's pierced Side, whereby we are united with Him. 2. That there were some other Ordinances, distinguished from these, in that our Lord had appointed no visible sign of them, or had not appointed them at all, or which were not necessary for all, or not of necessity for salvation, in the right use of which, however, grace was received.

I said, "Since[4] the Homilies call marriage a 'Sacrament,' it follows that the Articles do not reject the five rites as being in *any* sense 'Sacraments.' There is a remarkable correspondence between the Articles and the Homilies, in that both use qualifying and guarded expressions in speaking of the title of these rites to be called 'Sacraments.' Our Articles do not introduce words at random. It has then some meaning when our Articles say, they 'are not to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel*,' that they 'have not *like* nature of Sacraments;' or the Homilies, 'that[5] in the *exact* signification *of a Sacrament* there be but two,' or that 'Absolution is *no such Sacrament* as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are,' or that 'neither it [Absolution] *nor any other Sacrament* else be *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are,' or

[2] p. 97—106.
[3] p. 33—42.
[4] Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 34, 35.
[5] Homily ix., Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

that 'the ancient writers in giving the name not only to these five, but also to divers other ceremonies, did not mean to repute them as Sacraments *in the same signification* as the two,' or that St. Augustine, in the *exact meaning* of the word, makes mention expressly of two.' And with this coincides the definition of our Catechism, that there are 'two only generally [*i. e.* in genere, generically, and so universally to the whole class spoken of] necessary to salvation,' the others so entitled, not being of universal obligation, but relating to certain conditions and circumstances of life only. Certainly, persons, who denied these rites to be in any way Sacraments, (according to those larger definitions of St. Augustine, 'a sacred sign,' or 'a sign applied to things of God,' or of the Schoolmen, 'a sign of a sacred thing,') would have said so at once, and not have so uniformly and guardedly said on each occasion, that they were not such, in the '*exact*' or '*the same* signification,' the '*exact* meaning,' '*such*,' 'of the *like* nature;' nor, of one which they regarded as in no sense a Sacrament, would they have said 'neither it nor any other Sacrament else.'"

Again, the homily lays down what it considers "the exact signification of a Sacrament," namely, "visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our holiness *and joining in Christ*, there be but two, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord."

And it then proceeds to say that it is on this very ground, not that it has not true inward grace, but that "this promise is not annexed and tied to the visible sign," that it does not consider Absolution a Sacrament, "in the *exact* signification of a Sacrament." "For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins, yet, by the express word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise *annexed and tied to the visible sign*, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is *no such* Sacra-

ment as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are."

I may add the sequel of this passage of the homily, both in order to give, in the context, words which I have already quoted from it, as also because it illustrates the statement of the 25th Article.

"But, in a general acceptation, the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word, the ancient writers have given this name not only to the other five, commonly, of late years, taken and used for supplying the number of the Seven Sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as Sacraments, *in the same signification* that the two forenamed Sacraments are. And therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signification and *exact* meaning of the word, writing to Januarius, and also in the third book of Christian doctrine, affirmeth that the 'Sacraments of Christians, as they are most excellent in signification, so are they most few in number;' and in both places maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. And although there are retained by the order of the Church of England, besides these two, certain other rites and ceremonies about the institution of Ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation of Children, by examining them of their knowledge in the Articles of the Faith, and joining thereto the prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for the Visitation of the Sick; yet no man ought to take these for Sacraments *in such signification and meaning* as the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; but either for godly states of life, necessary in Christ's Church, and therefore worthy to be set forth by public action and solemnity, by the Ministry of the Church, or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's Church."

These last words supply what is wanting in the 25th Article. The division of the "five commonly called Sacraments" is manifestly not complete; since Confirmation, which both in teaching and practice the Church of

England highly esteems, cannot be included under the "corrupt following of the Apostles," as, of course, it cannot be "a state of life." The homily classes together "the institution of Ministers" and "Matrimony" as "godly states of life;" "Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick" as "ordinances which may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's Church." I mention this because the Article cannot be construed (as some have recently argued) as casting any slur upon Absolution, unless it condemn Confirmation also. It cannot be supposed to condemn either, since the Church of England provides the words[6] in which both are to be given.

And, lest any should think that I am herein making out a case, or offering to your Lordship a strained apology, I may quote exactly the same line of argument, in a work published in the same year as my letter to the Bishop of Oxford, and which received, after the first edition, the sanction of the Most Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury and of Armagh, to whom it was, by permission, inscribed. It has also, I have understood, been recommended to Candidates for Holy Orders. Mr. Palmer also cites, for the more extended use of the word Sacrament, not Fathers only but, in our own Church, Archbishops Cranmer and Secker, Bishop Taylor, and Mason:—"Baptism[7] and the Eucharist alone are in the Articles accounted 'Sacraments of the Gospel;' but matrimony, ordination, and other rites, are termed Sacraments in our homilies, approved by the Articles; so that there is no very marked difference as to the number of Sacraments between the two formularies; for the Necessary Doctrine does not pronounce the lesser Sacraments or rites of the Church to be 'Sacraments of the Gospel.'"

[6] The Church of England omits that portion of the older form which relates to the removal of the censures of the Church, "et sacramentis ecclesiæ te restituo," and retains that part which directly relates to the remission of sins. See Sarum Manual in Mr. Palmer's Antiq. of Eng. Rit. ii. 226.

[7] Treatise on the Church, P. 2. c. 7. T. i. p. 523. The Italics in the following passages occur in the original. The same argument occurs p. 510.

Again; "The rite[8] of ordination is not[9] a Sacrament of the Gospel, nor is it one of those 'generally[1] necessary to salvation;' but, since 'the[2] common description of a Sacrament' is, 'that it is a visible sign of an invisible grace;' and since, 'in a general acceptation, the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to any thing whereby an holy thing is signified;' since God, 'of His[3] divine providence, hath appointed divers orders in His Church;' since those who are ordained Bishops and Presbyters, are, 'by[4] the Holy Ghost, made overseers to feed the Church of God;' since God Himself gives to us such 'pastors[5] and teachers;' since it is evident that the Divine Grace promotes those who are duly ordained to the office of the ministry; and since this Divine Grace or commission is believed to be only given perfectly to those lawfully ordained, when they are actually ordained; the rite of ordination is 'a visible sign of an invisible grace,' and thus may reasonably be considered as a Sacrament of the Church. In fact, the homilies of the Church of England style it a Sacrament, even while establishing a distinction between it and the two great Sacraments of the Gospel. 'Though[6] the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign or promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as *all other Sacraments* besides the two above named do. Therefore neither it, nor *any Sacrament else*, be such Sacraments as baptism and the communion are.' Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Gregory, &c., style it a Sacrament[7]. Calvin also regards it as a Sacrament[8]. The apology

[8] Ib. T. ii. p. 441. [9] Article xxv. [1] Catechism.
[2] Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments.
[3] Collect for Ember Days. [4] Acts xx. 28.
[5] Ephes. iv. 11.
[6] Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments, part i.
[7] Hieron. lib. cont. Vigilant. p. 281; Augustin. lib. ii. cont. Parmen. c. xiii. t. ix. p. 45; Leo Epist. xi. al. lxxxi. ad Dioscorum, c. i. t. i. p. 436; Gregor. Mag. lib. iv. in Libr. Regum. c. v. t. iii. p. 228.
[8] 'Superest impositio manuum, quam ut in veris legitimisque ordinationibus sacramentum esse concedo, ita nego locum habere in hac fabula.' Inst. lib. iv. c. xix. art. 31.

of the confession of Augsburgh says that if 'order[9] be understood of the ministry of the word, we should without scruple, have called it a Sacrament. For the ministry of the word hath the commandment of God, and possesses glorious promises. If order be thus understood, we should not object to call the imposition of hands a Sacrament.' The learned Archdeacon Mason regarded order[1] as, in a certain sense, a Sacrament.

"As Bishop Taylor says, 'It[2] is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two Sacraments only; but that of those rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use called Sacraments (by a word of art), two only are generally necessary to salvation.' Archbishop Secker says, 'As[3] the word Sacrament is not a Scripture one, and hath at different times been differently understood; our Catechism doth not require it to be said absolutely, that the sacraments are *two only;* but *two only necessary to salvation:* leaving persons at liberty to comprehend more things under the name, if they please, provided they insist not on the necessity of them, and of dignifying them with this title.' And accordingly we find the Homilies speaking of 'the[4] sacrament of matrimony,' and acknowledging[5] several other sacraments besides those of baptism and the Eucharist. Cranmer, in his Catechism[6], considers absolution a sacrament. The confession of Augsburgh[7] and its Apology, hold the same view, and the latter adds matrimony[8]. In short,

[9] Apologia Confess. vii. De numero et usu sacrament.

[1] 'Si Sacramenti vocabulum ad quodvis externum signum a Deo institutum, cui divinæ gratiæ promissio annectitur, extendamus, sacrum ordinem dici posse una cum Sancto Augustino et aliis agnoscimus.' Mason. de Min. Angl. p. 48. ed. 1638.

[2] Taylor's Dissuasive, p. 240, ed. Cardwell.

[3] Secker's Lectures, xxxv. Of Baptism.

[4] Sermon on Swearing, part i.

[5] On Common Prayer and Sacraments, part i. See above, Vol. i. p. 510.

[6] Burnet, Hist. Ref. Vol. ii. p. 131.

[7] Confess. August. Art. 11. 12. 22. Apol. Confess. cap. de nu. et usu Sacr. ad art. 13.

[8] Ibid.

it is plain that the Reformation, in avoiding the error of arbitrarily defining the doctrine of *seven* sacraments, did not fall into the mistake of limiting the use of this term to *two* rites only, which would have ill accorded with the ancient custom of the Church generally."

The same use of the word "Sacramental," as to Absolution, occurs in Bishop Overall:—"The[9] Church of England, howsoever it holdeth not Confession and Absolution Sacramental, (that is, made unto and received from a priest), to be absolutely necessary, as that without it there can be no remission of sins; yet by this place it is manifest what she teacheth concerning the virtue and force of this sacred action. The confession is commanded to be *'special;'* the Absolution is the same as that of the Ancient Church, and the present Church of Rome useth: what would they have more? Maldonate, their greatest Divine that I meet with, (de Pœnit. p. 19,) saith thus: 'Ego autem sic respondendum puto non esse necesse, ut semper peccata remittantur per sacramentum pœnitentiæ, sed ut ipsum sacramentum naturâ suâ possit peccata remittere, si inveniat peccata et non inveniat contrarium impedimentum,' and so much we acknowledge. Our 'if he feels his conscience troubled,' is no more than 'si inveniat peccata;' for if he be not troubled with sin, what needs either confession or absolution? Venial sins, that separate not from the grace of God, need not so much to trouble a man's conscience. If he have committed any mortal sin, then we require confession of it to a priest, who may give him, upon his true contrition and repentance, the benefit of absolution, which takes effect according to his disposition that is absolved; and therefore the Church of Rome adds to the form of absolution, 'Quantum[1] in me est, et de jure possum, Ego te absolvo;' not absolutely, lest the doc-

[9] A MS. note on the Absolution in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, by Bishop Overall, written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book in Bishop Cosin's Library, printed in the year 1619, and taken from "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers."

[1] This is a mistake; the limitation does not relate to contrition (which is presupposed), but to "reserved cases."

trine should get head, that some of their ignorant people believe, that, be the party confessed never so void of contrition, the very act of absolution forgives him his sins. The truth is, that in the priest's absolution there is the true power and virtue of forgiveness, which will most certainly take effect, nisi ponitur obex, as in Baptism."

I do not see how I could, even consistently with the teaching of our Church, have denied Absolution to be in some degree a Sacrament, as assuredly it is a means or sign of grace given, although our Lord has been pleased to distinguish those two greater Sacraments, by appointing Himself the visible matter which should be used in them. But I took pains to express myself as the Church of England does, and with express reference to her teaching. When, in a work which I was editing, the Holy Eucharist and Absolution were classed as "Sacraments" *together*, I omitted the mention of Absolution, in part for the express reason that, "to[2] rank Absolution (although a Divine ordinance and means of grace, and so, in the larger sense of the word, a Sacrament) at once with the Holy Eucharist, would have seemed contrary to our Church's teaching, and the exceeding greatness of the Holy Eucharist."

But it was, in accordance, I thought, with the teaching of the Church of England, that in editing the "Spiritual Combat," I retained the words, "the most holy sacrament of Absolution" (p. 13); "the sacrament of Penitence" (p. 135) with the following note (p. 13):—"As Marriage is so called in the Homilies, which also say that 'Absolution *hath the promise of forgiveness of sins;* yet by the express word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise *annexed and tied* to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. They speak of 'other sacraments,' although not so great as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which directly unite us with Christ."

I did not, then, exclude the title of Sacrament, when it occurred in the book which I was editing, lest I should seem to deny what our Church must believe, that it is an appointed means of grace, and what it in some

[2] Surin, Foundation of the Spiritual Life, p. 228. note c.

sense calls it. I retained it, and explained its use in accordance with the teaching of the Church. When preaching myself before the University, I did not use it, regarding it as best not to draw off the attention from the substance, by the use of a word which is not essential, and which required explanation. On the same ground, I did not, as I have already said[3], use the term "auricular confession." "Auricular confession" cannot, in itself, mean any thing but private confession, or, what the "Service for the Visitation of the Sick" calls "a special confession of his sins." Still it is technical language not familiar in our Church. It has also been used especially of, and almost appropriated to, the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome. One of the homilies[4] speaks of *their* (the Roman Catholic) "auricular confession;" and it appears, from the context, that it means that "compulsory confession" which, it says, "is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should *be bound* to the numbering of his sins." And, after it, Hooker—who himself (it is known), used to the great comfort of his soul, private confession with Saravia — speaks against "auricular confession" as not being contained in St. Cyprian; assuredly meaning, not what the Church of England allowed, and he himself used, but the necessity of confession as a condition of pardon and salvation. "The[5] Minister's power to absolve is publicly taught and professed; the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power; upon the people no such *necessity imposed* of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible; neither any such opinion had of the thing itself, as though it were either unlawful or unprofitable, save only for these inconveniences which the world hath by experience observed in it heretofore."

On the subject of confession, Mr. Palmer speaks distinctly[6]:—"The practice of private confession to priests, and absolution she never

[3] See also Postscript to the Letter to Mr. Richards, p. 294—297.
[4] Hom. xx. Of repentance, 2nd Part. [5] E. P. vi. 4. 15.
[6] Church of Christ, P. II. c. 7. t. i. p. 518.

abolished. It is said, that the form of administering the Eucharist, drawn up by eighteen Bishops and other clergy in 1547, left private confession entirely to the option of individuals[7]; but strictly speaking, this license related not so much to the practice of confession in general, as to the particular custom of confessing before receiving the Eucharist[8]. That the Church did not mean to abolish confession and absolution (which she even regards as a sort of sacrament[9]) in general, appears from the Office of the Eucharist, and for the Visitation of the Sick, then drawn up, and from the powers conferred on priests in the Ordination Services. The Homilies, drawn up in 1562, only declared this confession and absolution not essential generally to the pardon of sin[1]; but this does not militate against its desirableness and benefit, which the Church never denied[2]. We only disused the canon, 'omnis utriusque sexûs,' made by the Synod of Lateran in 1215, and for good reasons restored the practice of confession to the state it was in previously, when it was not enjoined at a particular time every year. The alteration was merely in a matter of changeable discipline."

To sum up, then, what I believe and have taught on this head:—

1. I fully believe that any sin will be forgiven by God upon a deep and entire repentance, for the Merits of

7 Burnet, Vol. ii. p. 120, 123.

8 Ibid. p. 119.

9 "Absolution is no *such* sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are, . . . but in a general acceptation, the name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything, whereby an holy thing is signified," &c.—Sermon on Common Prayer and Sacraments, Part I.

1 Sermon of Repentance, Part II.

2 Ibid. See Exhortation in the Communion Office, and the Visitation of the Sick. The national Synod of Ireland, A.D. 1634, in their 64th Canon, charged all Ministers not to reveal offences entrusted to them in private confession, under pain of irregularity. Private confession was also approved by the Lutherans.—See the Confession of Augsburgh, P. I. Art. xi. De Confessione, P. II. Art. iv. Apol. Confess. vi. Articuli Smalcald. P. III. Art. viii.; and Luther's Catechismus Minor, where the form of confession and absolution is prescribed.

our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Alone, and that those Merits are the only source of all forgiveness.

Surely, one cannot see the blessed lives and deathbeds of persons, who, without confession to man, live in the true faith and fear and love of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, without believing that they are in the full grace and favour of God. I have never taught that confession to man was necessary to forgiveness, and have said that in 1548 the Church of England had gone back to her earlier condition, as expressed in the "Pœnitentiale[3] of Theodore, when some confessed their sins to God alone, some to the Priests; and both with great fruit within the Holy Church."

2. I also believe that "Our Lord[4] Jesus Christ hath left power with His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him." This power I believe to be Ministerial, as in Baptism, since it pleases God to employ visible instruments in conveying His Mercies to the soul.

3. This power, I believe, to be conferred on Priests in their ordination, in the solemn words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and that which is done in His Name, and according to His Will, He confirms in Heaven, as He says, 'Whatsoever[5] ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

I lately, in order to express my meaning, quoted some words which I had cited from St. Cyprian; and may again repeat them to your Lordship, as I embodied them in preaching before the University[6].

"God, indeed, when He entrusteth man with his Divine Authority, doth not part with it so as to confirm that which through the sin, either of him who useth it, or him for whom it is used, is done contrary to His Will. 'Pardon,' says St. Pacian, 'is in such wise not refused to true penitence, as that no

[3] Letter to Mr. Richards, p. 104.
[4] Visitation for the Sick.
[5] St. Matt. xviii. 18.
[6] Sermon I. on Absolution, p. 46, 47.

one thereby prejudgeth the future judgment of Christ.' 'We do not,' says St. Cyprian, 'anticipate the judgment of the Lord, Who will come to judge, but that, if He shall find a sinner's penitence full and entire, He will then ratify what has been determined by us. But if any have deluded us by a feigned penitence, God, 'Who is not mocked,' and Who 'looketh on the heart' of man, will judge of those whom we have not seen through, and the Lord will correct the sentence of His servants.' Yet God doth not less, through His servants, what is done aright in His Name, because others speak in that Name perversely."

Again, I quoted St. Ambrose's words, "Sins[7] are forgiven by the Holy Ghost, but men supply their ministry, yet do not exercise the right of any power; for they do not forgive sins in their own name, but in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. They pray, God giveth; the service is through man, the richness of the gift is from the Power on High."

The same distinction is preserved by Bishop Taylor: The "Priest[8] is the minister of holy things. He does that by his ministry which God effects by real dispensation; and as he gives the Spirit not by authority and proper efflux, but by assisting and dispensing those rites, and promoting those graces, which are certain dispositions to the receiving of him, just so he gives pardon: not as a king does it, nor yet as a messenger, that is, not by way of authority and real donation; nor yet *only* by declaration, but as a physician gives health; that is, he gives the remedy which God appoints; and if he does so, and God blesses the medicine, the person recovers, and God gives the health."

4. I believe that Absolution is not only a comfort, but is a means of grace to the soul; or rather is a comfort, because it is a means of grace to the soul; and that God, through man, pronounces forgiveness of sins upon all who truly repent and turn to Him.

5. I believe that, being a means of grace with an outward visible sign, it does, according to the teaching of

[7] Sermon II. on Absolution, p. 36, note.
[8] "Doctrine and Practice of Repentance," ch. x. sect. 4, § 51.

our Church, in a secondary sense, come under the title of "sacrament," and that our homilies in that secondary sense do so call it, as having "the promise of forgiveness of sins" (although not exclusively), and an outward sign, imposition of hands, although the grace of forgiveness is not tied or restricted to that act.

This cannot be said to be at variance with the doctrine of the Church of England. For I have used only the words of the Church herself, in their plain grammatical meaning. If others satisfy themselves with putting strained meanings on the words, and say, that when the Bishop says, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," this means, "to whomsoever ye preach the Gospel, and they believe it, they are remitted[9];" if they are satisfied for themselves that the words used mean no more than this, at least they need not exhibit those who receive them in their plain natural sense, as traitors to the English Church, or oppressors of the consciences of the English people. Is this the liberty of the Reformation, this the breaking of chains? or is it the forging of new chains, and the riveting of the chains of Satan? Is it contrary to the liberty of the Reformation to bind up the broken-hearted in the way in which they desire to be bound up? Do those who confess lay a burthen upon the consciences of others, when they seek to relieve their own? If "they who are sick," or feel themselves sick, "need a physician," and apply to those whom the Great, the only Physician has appointed, does this harm "the whole?" Is it with moral sickness, as with the cholera, that people fear to allow that any are sick, that any need to be healed, lest they should be thought sick themselves? How is it, that when we have heard so much of the "latitude[1] of interpretation intended by the framers of the Articles themselves," now all at once the Articles are to be stringent, when they cannot be distorted to slight "absolution," unless they condemn Confirmation also? Whence this panic, because an in-

[9] Zwingli and the Calvinist and Socinian School. See Sermon I. on Absolution, p. 42, and note B.

[1] Judgment of the Privy Council.

creasing number of persons have longed to "open the griefs" which oppressed them? Is "liberty of conscience" a liberty only to do what the multitude wills? Is none at liberty to use what others refuse? May none dare to minister a medicine to those who seek it, because others mislike it?

The Church of England very solemnly appeals to all "to consider the dignity of that holy Mystery, and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof; and so to search and examine their own consciences, (and that not lightly, and after the manner of dissemblers with God; but so) that they may come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast, in the marriage-garment required by God in Holy Scripture, and be received as worthy partakers of that holy Table." It warns persons. "Repent ye of your sins, or else come not to that holy Table; lest, after the taking of that holy Sacrament, the devil enter into you as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul." And then it says, "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." And now there has scarcely been a platform in the country, in which the very special offence alleged against those who have been denounced as traitors to the Church, has not been the obedience to this very direction of the Church, that ministers of the Church have received those who came to open their griefs to them. In a lecture given to nearly 6000 persons at Birmingham, it was set forth by a Clergyman as a deed which would justify him in inflicting personal violence. The coarseness of the language forbids further allusion either to the speech or the speaker.

You, my Lord, will feel

that that tender language of the first compilers of the Prayer Book [2], the same who are now made the very watchword of party to exterminate all confession to a Priest from the English Church, does speak the words of "truth and soberness" and Christian love: "requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church; but in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity; and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's Word to the same."

When Latimer says, "would to God right and true confession were kept in England, for *it is a good thing;*" and Ridley, that "confession unto the minister, which is able to instruct &c., might do much good in Christ's congregation;" and Ussher, "no kind of confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us;" and Wake, "The Church of England refuses no sort of confession," where is the authority for stirring up the people against those who, for the sake of others, give themselves up to minister to the sorrows of others?

I may repeat again what I before said, because it explains to your Lordship the principle upon which I have acted, and may be an answer to those who are goading the people.

"It [3] is an entire perversion of the whole question that some have ventured to speak of 'priestly power,' 'spiritual independence,' 'sacerdotal rights,' &c. If a physician goes about to minister to the sick, bind up the broken, apply to the cure of diseases the medicines which God has given

[2] In the first Prayer Book, in the reign of Edward VI., recognised even when, under foreign influence, it was withdrawn, towards the end of Edward VI.'s reign.

[3] Preface to Sermon I. on Absolution.

him the knowledge and the skill to use, no one speaks of 'assumption of power;' no one thinks it a part of independence,' to die neglected. Why then speak of 'priestly power,' when people ask the Ministers of God to impart that with which God has entrusted them? Why is it undue 'power' to bind up the broken-hearted, to pour into their wounds the wine and oil of penitence, to lift them up when desponding, to loose them, in Christ's Name, from the chains of their sins, and encourage them anew to the conflict? Why, but that to those who know not what the conflict is, what sin is, who have no idea of mental sickness, or anxiety, or distress, all, both sickness and remedy, must seem a dream? To minister to bodily wants is accounted a benefit; to minister to spiritual, which men know not of, is a reproach. In the world, 'they that exercise lordship over them are called benefactors;' but even an Apostle had occasion to say, 'Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?'"

I will close this subject with some additional words of Bishop Andrewes, in which he cites Bishop White, as declaring it to be "a slander" against the Church of England to say that she had abolished confession.

"Dr. White[4], in his 'Way to the Church,' (§ xl. 231,) quotes all this latter part of the Exhortation (in the Communion Service) showing against the slander of the Jesuits, that we abolish not, but willingly retain, the doctrine of confession."

[4] *From MS. Notes of Bishop Andrewes, in an interleaved book of Common Prayer in Bishop Cosin's Library* (quoted in Tracts of the Anglican Fathers).

II. Mr. Dodsworth's statement continues; "By teaching the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, as applicatory of the One Sacrifice of the Cross."

To this statement your Lordship perhaps adverts, when you say, "a propitiatory virtue is attributed to the Eucharist." I say, "perhaps," for your Lordship's words do not seem to myself to represent my meaning, and I trust that my meaning may approve itself to your Lordship. I stated many years ago (I trust that this is not an undue speaking about myself, since it is myself whom I am explaining), that "the word 'propitiatory' was taken in a good or bad sense, or the question looked upon as a mere question of words; so necessary is it to regard, not what words a person uses, but in what sense he uses them." I noticed that Ridley distinguished two senses of the word "propitiable," one only of which he seems to reject. "There[5] is also a doubt in the word 'propitiable,' whether it signify here that which taketh away sin, *or that which may be made available for the taking away of sin;* that is to say, whether it is to be taken in the active or in the passive signification."

[5] Tract 81, p. 50. I said again, in the Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 68, "Propitiatory" is, as Thorndike explains it, that which "doth render God propitious;" it is thus used by a modern Roman writer also, "we say, the Mass" [the Holy Eucharist] "is a propitiatory sacrifice, that is to say, a sacrifice that renders God propitiatory to man." (Dr. Butler's Lect. 8, p. 226.) Bishop Overall adopts the word as occurring in the Fathers, Tract. 81, p. 73, and others also. In the same sense Nelson prays "that I may so importunately plead the merit of it" [the full perfect Oblation on the Cross] "in this commemoration of that Sacrifice, as to render Thee gracious and *propitious* to me, a miserable sinner." (Ib. p. 303.) Those who with Bishop Jewell (ib. p. 61) and Bishop Hall (ib. p. 107) take "propitiatory" in the sense of "being" or "making a propitiation" must reject it. (Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 68, note.) Bishop Moreton acknowledges:—"In the which large acceptation Protestants may account it 'propitiatory' also." (Tract 81, p. 93.)

I cited also Dr. Waterland, who speaks approvingly of Pfaff, who had acknowledged that "the[6] Eucharist is propitiatory also in a qualified sober sense," and expresses his persuasion that "there is a great deal of truth in what that learned gentleman has said, and that a great part of the debate, so warmly carried on a few years ago, was more about names than things."

I cited also the statement of Pfaffius himself: "The Council of Trent maintains that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is propitiatory, and that this is to be believed under pain of anathema, which yet is not said in the service, which does not call the Holy Supper a 'sacrifice,' much less a 'propitiatory' one. Still the Tridentine Fathers, while they call the sacrifice of the Mass 'propitiatory,' distinguish it from the Sacrifice of the Body of Christ upon the Cross. For through the Sacrifice of the Cross, propitiation was so perfectly *obtained* for man, that nothing can be added to the price of our Redemption, as being infinite[7]. If then the propitiation has been acquired by the Sacrifice of the Cross, it is not *acquired* or *obtained* afresh by the Eucharistic sacrifice, unless you take *obtained* in the sense of *applied*. Whence it appears, how ambiguous that word 'propitiatory' is, in that it may be taken as well for the 'acquiring and obtaining,' as for the 'applying, of the one and the same thing, and so opens the door to numberless strifes of words. For if you say that the Eucharist 'applies' to the faithful the propitiation made by the Sacrifice of the Cross, no Protestant will dispute this. But if you believe that the devotion of the Eucharist acquires and obtains propitiation, you may be saying what is perhaps at variance from the opinion of the Church of Rome[8]."

[6] Doctrine of the Eucharist, c. xii. p. 345, ed. Van. Mildert.

[7] Heb. ix. 11. seq. x. 1. seq. 1 John i. 2.

[8] Pfaff. Diss. de Oblatione Vet. Eucharistica Irenæi Fragm. Anecdot. subject. p. 211. In illustration of the last words, it may be said, that Bellarmine says, that "a sacrifice being, so to speak, a sort of prayer in act, not in words, is properly 'impetratory.'" He adds, "the Sacrifice of the Cross was truly and properly meritorious, satisfactory, and impetratory, because Christ was then subject to death, and could merit and satisfy. The sacrifice of the Eucha-

This doctrine of a commemorative sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist has been maintained by a current of our Divines ever since the Reformation.

I believe it to be contained in Holy Scripture, in the prophecy by Malachi, of the pure offering which he foretold should be offered by the (then) heathen throughout the world, when the Jews had been rejected. It is part of our Blessed Saviour's priesthood after the order of Melchisedech, as this has ever been understood by the Church. It is witnessed to by the very mention of "altars" by our Lord and by St. Paul. It is contained in our Lord's own words, "Do this as a memorial of me[9]," pleading, He would say, My Merits, and representing My Death to the Father, until I come.

In this way the Apostolic Fathers spoke, and the whole Church until now. St. Clement of Rome says[1], "We must do all things in order, which the Lord commanded us to perform. At stated times must both oblations and sacred offices [liturgies] be performed," and he then contrasts with them the Jewish sacrifices. St. Ignatius speaks of "the Eucharist and oblations[2]," and "of the altar[3]." St. Justin M.[4] and St. Irenæus, in reference also to the Holy Eucharist, speak of the "one[5] oblation of the New Testament, which oblation the Church, receiving from the Apostles, throughout the whole world, offers to God," as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi.

This sacrifice is presented by the Son to the Father. "Offering," Origen says[6], "to the God of the universe prayers through His Only Begotten Son, beseeching Him, being the propitiation

rist (as offered by Christ the great High Priest) is properly only impetratory, because Christ, no longer being subject to death, can neither merit nor satisfy." (De Missa, ii. 4.)

[9] Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν "for *the* [specially appointed] memorial of Me:" ἀνάμνησις and μνημόσυνον being (as well as אזכרה, זכרון, of which they are translations) sacrificial words; Lev. xxiv. 7. Numb. x. 10. Lev. ii. repeatedly, and elsewhere.

[1] Ep. 1. ad Corinth.

[2] Ep. ad Smyrn. § 7. (Theodoret reads προσφοράς.)

[3] Ep. ad Eph. § 5. ad Magnes. § 7. ad Trall. § 7.

[4] Dial. c. Tryph. § 116—118.

[5] 4. 17. 5.

[6] Cont. Cels. viii. 13.

for our sins, to offer, as a High Priest, our prayers, and *sacrifices*, and intercessions to the God of all." Whence St. Cyril does not hesitate to use the word "propitiation" of the Eucharist, in a passage in which he is speaking of the great Eucharistic intercession[7]: "Then, after the Spiritual Sacrifice is perfected, the Bloodless Service upon that Sacrifice of Propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquillity of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted; and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succour, we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice."

My own belief I expressed at a time very eventful to me[8], in the words of Bp. Wilson: "May[9] it please Thee, O God, Who hast called us to this Ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this Sacrifice for our own sins and for the

[7] Cat. 23. Myst. v. § 8. Oxf. Tr.

[8] Sermon I. on Absolution, p. 3, 4.

[9] Sacra Privata. Sundry Meditations, *before service begins.* [It is taken probably from Heb. vii. 27, but perhaps is also a reminiscence of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, with which it corresponds; "Make us fit to offer unto Thee gifts and sacrifices for our sins and the ignorances of the people. So also S. Jerome, in Ep. ad Tit. i. 8, "What is to be thought of the Bishop who hath daily to offer spotless sacrifices to God for his own and his people's sins?"] Add ibid. "We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this Bread and this Cup. We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies; beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ; and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain a remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.

"May I atone Thee [Ed. 2. fol. 1782. Other Ed. have 'atone unto Thee.' The former is probably correct, 'atone' being so used for to 'appease'] by offering to Thee, O God, by offering to Thee the pure and unbloody Sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ. Amen."

And ibid. Wed. Medit. Lent. Meditations proper for a Clergyman. "Give me such holy dispositions of soul whenever I approach Thine Altar, as may in some manner be proportionable to the holiness of the work I am about, of presenting the prayers of the faithful, of offering a spiritual sacrifice to God, in order to convey the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ—the true Bread of Life—to all His members. Give me, when I commemorate the same sacrifice that Jesus Christ once offered, give me the same intentions

sins of Thy people." I will add now, in lieu of many others, the words of Oxford Divines, edited and revised by Bishop Fell[1]: "As also He hath instituted the same oblation of His Holy Body and Blood, and commemoration of His Passion, to be made in the holy Eucharist to God the Father by His Ministers here on earth, for the same ends, viz., the *application* of all the benefits of His sole meritorious Death and Sacrifice on the Cross, till His second return out of this heavenly sanctuary."

I believe most entirely, that "the Offering of Christ once made is that perfect

that He had, to satisfy the justice of God, to acknowledge His mercies, and to pay all that debt which a creature owes his Creator. None can do this effectually but Jesus Christ: Him, therefore, we present to God in this Holy Sacrament."

The following are extracts from Bishop Wilson's MS. notes, in his own hand, in the "Sacra Privata," now about to be published. Works, vol. iii. p. 219.

"By setting the memorials of Christ's Body and Blood before God, we show that we ourselves do remember His death, and beg God to remember His death in favour of us, now and whenever we pray to Him for His Son's sake."

Mr. Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice.

"The true and full notion of the Lord's Supper is, that it is a religious feast upon Bread and Wine, that have been offered in sacrifice to Almighty God, and are become the mysterious Body and Blood of Christ.

"Our sins were laid upon Christ, as they were upon the sacrifices under the Law, in order to be expiated by the shedding their blood."

Ends of Sacrifice.

"To render our prayers more acceptable to God for what we pray for.

"As a grateful sense of favours received.

"For procuring pardon for sins committed.

"To acknowledge the power of God to whom we offer.

"To render Him gracious to the worshippers.

"To keep communion with Him.

"But above all,—That it might be a perpetual memorial of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the sins of the world. By which He reconciled us to God, obtained our pardon upon our repentance, grace to amend our lives, an happy death, and a blessed resurrection. The commemoration of this Sacrifice the most prevailing argument we can make use with God for these things."

[1] "Paraphrase and Annotations, done by several eminent men at Oxford, corrected and improved by the late Right Rev. and Learned Bishop Fell."—On Heb. v. 10.

redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone." I cannot but believe (since I continually repeat to Almighty God) that "our Lord Jesus Christ made upon the Cross a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." I do not believe that any other sacrifice is meritorious, or *in itself* propitiatory, *i. e.* that it has a value of its own, apart from the One Sacrifice, to propitiate God. But I believe that He who "did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of His Precious Death, until His Coming again," does look graciously upon, and present in Heaven, the Memorial which we make on earth. The Eucharistic Oblation expresses, in action, the same as, in words, the Confession wherewith we close each prayer, "through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is something out of ourselves, above and besides our prayers. It is a pleading of our Lord's Passion in act, a Memorial of it, not to ourselves, but to God. It has its efficacy, because Christ has appointed it; because, in His abiding Priesthood after the order of Melchisedech, He pleads, in Heaven, what He has commanded us to plead on earth; and the prayers which we offer are then most heard, when the "pledges of His love" lie before God. We plead to the Eternal Father the Infinite Merits of His Son, that Infinite Price, which, by His precious Death, He made for our Redemption. We present before Him, not mere bread and wine, but that which, without physical change of substance, consecrated by the words of our Lord and the power and grace of God, is verily and indeed, not carnally, but mystically, sacramentally, spiritually, and in an ineffable and supernatural way, the Body and Blood of our Lord. In Field's[2] words, paraphrasing the Ancient Prayer, "We offer to Thy view, and set before Thine eyes, the Crucified Body of Christ Thy Son, which is here present in mystery and Sacrament, and the Blood

[2] Of the Church. Appendix to Book iii.

which He once shed for our sakes, which we know to be that pure, holy, undefiled, and eternal Sacrifice, wherewith only Thou art pleased; desiring Thee to be merciful unto us for the merit and worthiness thereof, and so to look upon the same sacrifice, which representatively we offer to Thy view, as to accept it for a full discharge of us from our sins, and a perfect propitiation: that so Thou mayest behold us with a pleased, cheerful, and gracious countenance." In St. Ambrose's words[3], "Christ is offered upon earth, when the Body of Christ is offered; yea, He Himself is shown in us to offer, Whose word sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered. And He Himself is present for us as an Advocate with the Father."

This was the time when, both in the Ancient Church and in our own, the most solemn prayers for the well-being of the Church were offered to God. Our own prayer for the Church Militant follows herein the Ancient Church. We pray Almighty God to "accept our alms and *oblations*, and receive our prayers," as, in the great Eucharistic prayer in the Ancient liturgies, the Church besought God for all. "I join with Thy Church," says again good Bishop Wilson[4], "and plead the merits of Thy Sacrifice for all estates and conditions of men: that none may deprive themselves of that happiness which Thou hast purchased by Thy Death:—for all Christian Kings and Governors;—for all Bishops and Pastors; for all persons and places in distress by the sword, pestilence, and famine, &c."

I have made this statement, wishing to make clear my meaning, rather than the use of a word. The word which your Lordship objects to is, "propitiatory." It has been used, as I said, in a good or bad sense, according as persons have taken it. In two places only, as far as I know, have I retained the words "propitiation" or "propitiatory;" but in both, in order to prevent misunderstanding, I added (by the advice of a revered friend, whom, being in doubt, I consulted) "or deprecation," or "depreca-

[3] In Ps. 38. § 25.
[4] Short Introduction to the Lord's Supper.

tory". The prayers themselves sufficiently explained, that the word was limited to the sense which Mr. Dodsworth assigns to it, "as applicatory to the One Sacrifice of the Cross," "This[5] do I now present and offer unto Thee, O Holy Father! now that in this Communion I renew the remembrance of It." "I beseech Thee for Thy Mercy's sake, and for the merit of that Propitiatory Sacrifice which was finished on the Cross, that thou wouldest put away from us all stumbling-blocks, temptations, perils, occasions of sin, by which Thou foreseest that we may be led again to sin." "And all these [the sufferings and Death of our Lord] do I offer unto Thee as the satisfaction for my sins; and that, by means of this sacrifice, that by virtue of it, Thou mayest impart to me the virtue and efficacy of those Sufferings, and mercifully forgive my offences, and take not vengeance of my sins."

This teaching I learnt in our own Divines and in the Fathers long before I read a Roman Catholic writer. On this doctrine, taught as it is by our Divines in succession, your Lordship makes no observation. Not to your Lordship, who are familiar with our old Divines, but to explain to others my teaching, I would set down the words of Bishop Taylor.

"It is[6] the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy, and means of impetration, in this world. For when Christ was consecrated on the Cross, and became our High Priest, having reconciled us to God by the Death of the Cross, He became infinitely gracious in the eyes of God, and was admitted to the celestial and eternal Priesthood in Heaven, where, in the virtue of the Cross, He intercedes for us, and represents an eternal Sacrifice in the Heavens on our behalf. That He is a Priest in Heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of St. Paul. That there is no other Sacrifice to be offered, but that on the Cross, it is evident, because 'He hath once appeared, in the end of the

[5] Paradise for the Christian Soul, Part V. p. 47, 48. 54.

[6] Worthy Communicant, Chap. I. sect. iv. A similar passage of Bishop Taylor is quoted by the Bishop of Oxford, Eucharistica, p. 216, 217.

world, to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself;' and, therefore, since it is necessary that He hath something to offer, so long as He is a Priest, and there is no other Sacrifice but that of Himself offered upon the Cross, — it follows that Christ, in Heaven, perpetually offers and represents that Sacrifice to His Heavenly Father; and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for His Church."

"Now, what Christ does in Heaven, He hath commanded us to do on earth, that is, to represent His Death, to commemorate His Sacrifice, by humble prayer and thankful record; and, by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist, to lay It before the eye of our Heavenly Father, so ministering in His Priesthood, and doing according to His commandment and example: the Church being the image of Heaven; the priest, the minister of Christ; the Holy Table being a copy of the Celestial Altar; and the Eternal Sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world being always the same. It bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the Cross; but It is wonderfully represented in Heaven, and graciously represented here: by Christ's action there, by His commandment here. And the event of it is plainly this: that as Christ, in virtue of His Sacrifice on the Cross, intercedes for us with His Father, so does the minister of Christ's priesthood here; that the virtue of the eternal Sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the Church, both for things temporal and eternal. And, therefore, it was not without great mystery and clear signification, that our Blessed Lord was pleased to command the representation of His Death and Sacrifice on the Cross should be made, by breaking of bread and effusion of wine; to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the Liturgy we are about, and that we minister in the Priesthood of Christ, Who is a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedech: that is, we are ministers in that unchangeable Priesthood, imitating, in the external ministry, the prototype Melchizedech: of whom it was said, 'He brought forth bread and wine, and was the Priest of the Most High God;' and, in the internal, imitating the anti-type or

the substance, Christ Himself; Who offered up His Body and Blood for atonement for us; and, by the Sacraments of bread and wine, and the prayers of oblation and intercession, commands us to officiate in His Priesthood, in the external ministering, like Melchizedech; in the internal, after the manner of Christ Himself."

Again, Bishop William Forbes: "The Holy[7] Fathers, also, very often say that the very Body of Christ is offered, and sacrificed in the Eucharist, as is clear from almost innumerable passages, but not properly and really, with all the properties of a sacrifice preserved, but by a commemoration and representation of that which was once accomplished in that one Sacrifice of the Cross, whereby Christ, our High Priest, consummated all other sacrifices; and by pious supplication, whereby the Ministers of the Church, for the sake of the eternal Victim of that one Sacrifice, which sitteth in Heaven at the Right Hand of the Father, and is present in the Holy Table in an unspeakable manner, humbly beseech God the Father that He would grant that the virtue and grace of this eternal Victim may be effectual and salutary to His Church, for all the necessities of body and soul."

Again, Dr. Brevint, whose work on the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, was "republished[8] on the high commendation of Waterland, says: "Whereas[9] the Holy Eucharist is by itself a Sacrament, wherein God offers unto all men the blessings merited by the Oblation of His Son, it likewise becomes by our remembrance a kind of sacrifice also; whereby, to obtain at His hand the same blessings, we present and expose before His eyes, that same holy and precious Oblation once offered. Neither the Israelites had ever temple, or ark, or mercy-seat, nor the Christians have any ordinance, devotion, or mystery that may prove to be such a blessed and effectual instrument to reach to this everlasting Sacrifice, and to set it out so solemnly

[7] Considerationes Modestæ, lib. iii. c. i. quoted Tract. 81, p. 109.
[8] Bishop of Oxford's Eucharistica, p. xxv.
[9] Ib. p. 180 Tract 81, p. 109.

before the eyes of God Almighty, as the Holy Eucharist is. To men it is a sacred Table, where God's Minister is ordered to represent from God his Master, the Passion of His Dear Son, as still fresh and still powerful for their eternal salvation; and to God it is an altar, whereon men mystically present to Him the same sacrifice as still bleeding, and still sueing for expiation and mercy. And because it is the High Priest Himself, the true Anointed of the Lord, Who hath set up most expressly both this table and this altar for these two ends, namely, for the communication of His Body and Blood to men, and for the representation and memorial of Both to God; it cannot be doubted but that the one must be most advantageous to the penitent sinner, and the other most acceptable to that good and gracious Father, Who is always pleased in His Son, and Who loves of Himself the repenting and the sincere return of His children. Hence one may see both the great use and advantage of more frequent Communion; and how much it concerns us, whensoever we go to receive it, to lay out all our wants, and pour out all our grief, our prayers and our praises, before the Lord, in so happy a conjuncture. The primitive Christians did it so, who did as seldom meet to preach or pray, without a Communion, as did the old Israelites to worship, without a Sacrifice. On solemn days especially, or upon great exigencies, they ever used this help of sacramental oblation, as the most powerful means the Church had to strengthen their supplications, to open the gates of Heaven, and to force, in a manner, God and His Christ, to have compassion on them."

To this doctrine, that this One Sacrifice of the Cross is, through the Oblation of the Holy Eucharist, pleaded to God the Father by the prayers of the Church, and that benefits hence accrue to the Church and to those for whom intercession is made, and who do not shut it out by perseverance in sin or unbelief, your Lordship, I am satisfied, would not object. The prayers of the Church are essential; yet the Oblation gives them a value, which, alone, they would not have. Our Ever-Blessed Lord, unceasingly presents in Heaven that Sacrifice which He once

offered on the Cross; day and night, "He, our only access to the Father, as Mediator, and High Priest, and Advocate, presenteth to the Father intercessions for us, Who as the Son and God, giveth, with the Father, all good things to man, Co-Giver of all blessing to us.[1]" In Bishop Pearson's words[2], "He Which was accepted in His Oblation, and therefore sat down on God's Right Hand, to improve this acceptation, continues His intercession: and having obtained all power by virtue of His humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting His postulations at the throne of God."

He the One High Priest, having entered once for all into the Holy of Holies, the Heaven of Heavens, is there our Unchangeable, Unceasing Intercessor, "ever living to make Intercession for us." At the Holy Eucharist we are admitted, as it were, to see in image, (as St. Ambrose saith,) what in truth He ever doth in Heaven. He Himself invisibly sanctifieth what is offered, Himself, the Only High Priest, offereth before the Father, what His Word sanctifieth. The Church pleadeth as a suppliant that same sacrifice, which He presenteth as High Priest, efficaciously.

"Therefore," says Bishop Overall[3], "there is no new sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to God by Christ in heaven, and continueth here still on earth, by a mystical representation of It in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross and to appease His wrath towards us, to get blessings from Him, to make Christ's bloody Sacrifice effectual unto us. . . ."

And Bishop Andrewes[4]: —"The first, in remembrance of Him, Christ. What of Him? *Mortem Domini*, His death, saith St. Paul,

[1] S. Cyril. Alex. in S. Joann. xvi. 19, 20. p. 934, 935.
[2] On the Creed, Article vi. p. 479.
[3] Printed from MS. Notes in Nicholls on the Common Prayer.
[4] Sermons of the Resurrection, Serm. VII. p. 300, ed. Oxf.

'to shew forth the Lord's Death.' Remember Him? That we will, and stay at home, think of Him there. Nay, show him forth ye must. That we will by a sermon of Him. Nay, it must be *hoc facite*. It is not mental thinking, or verbal speaking, there must be actually somewhat done to celebrate this memory. That done to the holy symbols that was done to Him, to His body and His blood in the Passover; break the one, pour out the other, to represent κλώμενον, how His sacred Body was 'broken,' and ἐκχυνόμενον, how His precious Blood was 'shed.' And in *Corpus fractum* and *sanguis fusus*, there is *immolatus*. This is it in the Eucharist that answereth to the sacrifice in the Passover, the memorial to the figure. To them it was, *Hoc facite in Mei præfigurationem*, 'Do this in prefiguration of Me.' To them *prænuntiare*, to us *annuntiare;* there is the difference. By the same rules that theirs was, by the same may ours be, termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them; for, to speak after the exact manner of Divinity, there is but one only Sacrifice, *veri nominis*, 'properly so called,' that is, Christ's death. And that sacrifice but once actually performed at His death, but ever before represented in figure from the beginning; and ever since repeated in memory, to the world's end. That only absolute, all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. The Lamb, but once actually slain in the fulness of time, but virtually was from the beginning, is and shall be to the end of the world. That the centre, in which their lines and ours, their types and our antitypes do meet. While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it in theirs. And after it is past, the memory of it is still kept fresh in mind by the commemoration of it in ours. So it was the will of God, that so there might be with them a continual foreshowing, and with us a continual showing forth, the 'Lord's death till he come again.' Hence it is that what names theirs carried, ours do the like; and the Fathers make no scruple at it—no more need we. The Apostle in the tenth chapter compareth this of ours to the *immolata* of the heathen; and to the Hebrews, *habemus aram*,

matcheth it with the sacrifice of the Jews. And we know the rule of comparisons, they must be *ejusdem generis*. . . .

"From the Sacrament, is the applying the Sacrifice. The Sacrifice, in general, *pro omnibus*. The Sacrament, in particular, to each several receiver, *pro singulis*. Wherein that is offered *to us*, that was offered *for us*: that which is common to all, made proper to each one, while each taketh his part of it; and made proper by a communion, and union, like that of meat and drink, which is most nearly and inwardly made ours, and is inseparable for ever."

And Bishop White[5]: — "Because His bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross is, by this unbloody commemoration represented, called to remembrance, and *applied*."

And Archbishop Bramhall[6]:—"We acknowledge a representation of that Sacrifice to God the Father; we acknowledge an imputation of the benefit of it; we maintain *an application of its virtue*: so here is a commemorative, impetrative, applicative Sacrifice. Speak distinctly, and I cannot understand what you can desire more. To make it a suppletory Sacrifice, to supply the defects of the only true Sacrifice of the Cross, I hope both you and I abhor."

And Scrivener[7]: — "In like manner, and much more effectually, may we say, that the action of the Eucharist presents to God the Sacrifice of Christ's Death and Mediation made by Him for mankind, especially those that are immediately concerned in that Sacrament; from which metonymical Sacrifice what great and rich benefits may we not expect!"

And Dr. Hammond[8]:— "This commemoration hath two branches,—one of praise and thanksgiving to God for this mercy, the other of annunciation or showing forth, — not only first to men, but secondly, and especially, to God,—this sacrifice of Christ's offering up His Body upon the Cross for us. That which respecteth or looks towards men, is a professing of our faith in the Death of Christ; that which looks towards God, is our pleading before

5 Reply to Fisher.
6 Works, p. 35, 36.
7 Course of Divinity, Book i. chap. 44.
8 Quoted in Bishop of Oxford's Eucharistica, p. 166.

Him that Sacrifice of His own Son, and through that, humbly and with affiance, requiring the benefits thereof, grace and pardon, to be bestowed upon us. And then God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it."

And Bishop Patrick[9]:—"For remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) doth not barely signify recording or registering of His favours in our mind, but *commemoratio*, a solemn declaration that we do well bear them in our hearts, and will continue the memory and spread the fame of Him as far and as long as ever we are able. . . .

"1. We do show forth the Lord's death, and declare it unto men.

"2. We do show it forth unto God, and commemorate before Him the great things He hath done for us. We keep it, as it were, in His memory, and plead before Him the Sacrifice of His Son, which we show unto Him, humbly requiring that grace and pardon, with all other benefits of it, may be bestowed upon us. And as the minister doth most powerfully pray in the virtue of Christ's Sacrifice when he represents it unto God, so do the people also when they show unto Him what His Son hath suffered."

But, in truth, whosoever believeth that there is an Oblation to God in the Holy Eucharist, by which, pleading the Death of Christ before the Father, we obtain favour from Him, believes a "propitiatory" action in the only sense in which it is believed at all, which is to "render God propitious." The doctrine lies equally in the simple words of Bishop Andrewes[1], from the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom:—"Thou Who sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly present with us, come Thou to sanctify the gifts laid before Thee, and *those for whom*, and by whom, and *for what reason soever* they are offered."

This, which is contained in Bishop Andrewes' simple but comprehensive words, is the only doctrine

[9] Quoted in Bishop of Oxford's Eucharistica, p. 166.
[1] Devotions.

which I ever meant, in any of my books, to teach, that God the more accepts our prayers for ourselves or for others, whether for forgiveness of sins, for increase of grace, for the well being of the Church, or for whatsoever else is according to His Will, when united with the Memorial of His All Atoning and alone Meritorious Sacrifice, which He instituted and commanded the Church to celebrate. But while I say that this is the *only* doctrine, I do not mean it, as lowering that doctrine, but this only, that the Sacrifice or Oblation in the Eucharist has its efficacy, only by pleading and applying the One Sacrifice of the Cross."

I may quote again the words of Mr. Palmer:— "*Secondly*[2], the Church of England has always acknowledged such a sacrifice. The 31st Article is directed against the vulgar and heretical doctrine of the *reiteration* of Christ's Sacrifice in the Eucharist. It was only those 'missarum sacrificia *quibus vulgo dicebatur*, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis,' which are pronounced 'blasphema figmenta et perniciosæ imposturæ;' but not 'missarum sacrificia,' as understood by the Fathers, and in an orthodox sense. The article was directed against the errors maintained or countenanced by such men as Soto, Hardinge[3], &c., who by rejecting the doctrine of a sacrifice by *way of commemoration and consecration*, and not literally identical with that on the Cross, and by their crude and objectionable mode of expression, countenanced the *vulgar error*, that the sacrifice of the Eucharist or mass, was in every respect equal to that of Christ on the Cross; and that it was in fact either a reiteration or a continuation of that sacrifice. The Article was not directed against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as explained by Bossuet, Veron, and others, with which we have no material fault to find. Cranmer himself acknowledged that it might be called a sacrifice[4]; and our theologians, such as Bramhall, Beveridge, Patrick,

[2] Treatise of the Church, Part VI. ch. x.
[3] Courayer, Défense de la Dissertation, t. ii. part i. p. 223.
[4] See vol. i. p. 525.

Wilson, Bishops; and Mason[5], Field, Mede, Johnson, &c., always have taught the Eucharistic altar, sacrifice, and oblation, according to Scripture and apostolical tradition; and the Articles of the Church of England recognize the clergy in their various orders as sacerdotes, ἱερεῖς, ministers of sacrifice."

I will add one more passage from a writer, always held in reputation of our Church, in which he adopts the word "propitiation" as found in the Ancient Fathers. The familiar epithet mostly joined to his name,—as that of "judicious" is to that of Hooker,—"the learned Mede," shows how he has been appreciated by our Church. "Instead[6], therefore, of the slaying of beasts and burning of incense, whereby they called upon the Name of God in the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour ordained the Sacrament of Bread and Wine, as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to His Father in His Name."

"The mystery of which rite they took to be this: That as Christ, by presenting His Death and Satisfaction to His Father, continually intercedes for us in Heaven; so the Church on earth semblably approaches the Throne of Grace, by representing Christ unto His Father in these Holy Mysteries of His Death and Passion. These things thus explained, let us now see by what testimonies and authorities it may be proved the Ancient Church had this meaning. I will begin with St. Ambrose, because his testimony is punctual to our explication. Offic. lib. i. cap. 48. 'Heretofore (under the Law) was wont to be offered a lamb and a bullock. (Exod. xxix.) But now (under the Gospel) Christ is offered; but He is offered as a Man, and as one that suffered; and He also as a Priest offers Himself, for the forgiveness of our sins. Here (on earth) this is done in a resemblance and representation; there (in Heaven) in truth, where He as our Advocate intercedes for us with His Father.'

[5] "Quoties eucharistiam celebramus, toties Christum in mysterio offerimus, eundemque per modum commemorationis seu repræsentationis immolamus."—Mason. de Minister. Anglic. lib. v. c. 1. p. 544.

[6] Christian Sacrifice, c. vi.

An author which Cassander in his Consultations, quotes, without name, expresses this mystery fully: 'Christ is not wickedly slain by us, but piously sacrificed, and thus we show the Lord's Death till He come; for we by Him do that here on earth lowlily, which He (as a Son to be heard for His reverence or piety) doth for us in Heaven powerfully and prevailingly, where He as our Advocate mediates for us with the Father, Whose office it is to intercede for us, and to present that flesh which He took for us and of us, to God the Father in our behalf.'"

Then, after quoting St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whom I have cited above, he says that it is the manner of the Greek liturgies, (to which I have also referred,)—immediately upon the consecration of the *Dona* (viz. the Bread and Wine) to be the symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Commemoration thereon of His Passion, Resurrection and Ascension,—to offer to the Divine Majesty, as it were over the Lamb of God then lying upon the Table, their supplications and prayers, for the whole state of Christ's Church, and all sorts and degrees therein, together with all other their suits and requests; and that ever and anon interposing the word προσφέρομεν, 'we offer unto Thee,' for these and these, that is, we commemorate Christ in this mystical rite for them."

And he cites Eusebius, who, after speaking of Bishops who at a council gave instructions by discourses of Theology or interpretations of the deeper meaning of Holy Scripture, adds, "Those who were not equal to these things, *propitiated* God by unbloody sacrifices and sacramental immolations in behalf of the common peace, of the Church of God, of the Emperor himself, offering to God suppliant prayers for him who was the author of these great benefits, and his godly children."

The same he supposes to be the meaning of a passage of Tertullian[7]; and thereupon adds: "The same with Tertullian means St. Austin, describing the Christian sacrifice to be, 'immolare Deo in Corpore Christi sacrificium Laudis,'

[7] De Orat. c. 11. He had a wrong reading.

lib. i. cont. Advers. Legis et Prophet. cap. 20. 'The Church, saith he, offereth unto God the Sacrifice of praise in the Body of Christ, ever since the fulfilling of that in Ps. l. 'The God of gods hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof.'

"Lastly, that the representation of the Body and Blood of Christ in this Christian Service was intended and used as a rite whereby to find grace and favour with God, when the Church addressed herself unto Him (which is that I undertook to prove), is apparent by a saying of Origen, Hom. 13 in Levit., where, treating of the shew-bread, which was continually set before the Lord with incense, for a memorial of the children of Israel, that is, to put God in mind of them, he makes it in this respect to have been a lively figure of the Christian's Eucharist; for, saith he, 'That is the only commemoration which renders God propitious to men.'"

III. The next statement is: "and by Adoration of Christ really present on the altar under the form of bread and wine."

This statement involves two points, which in my own mind are distinct: 1. The real Presence of our Lord; 2. The Adoration of Christ Present in the Holy Eucharist.

1. Of the Real Presence of our Lord I have spoken so much at length, and what I wrote was so widely circulated [8], that I need hardly repeat here what I have said. I believe simply the teaching of our Church, in the Catechism, the Articles, and the Eucharistic Service. I believe that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." I believe that "then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood; we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." I believe that we "so eat the Flesh of God's dear Son Jesus Christ, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood;" that we may "evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." I believe that "the Body and Blood of Christ which were given and shed for us" [not assuredly His absent Body and Blood, nor a figure only of His Body and Blood] "preserve our Bodies and Souls unto everlasting life." I believe that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten," [given by the Priest and taken by the people] "only after a spiritual and heavenly manner" [*i. e*, not in any carnal, or physical, or earthly manner, but spiritually, sacramentally, truly and ineffably]. And I believe that "the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." For assuredly Faith only perceives, faith only receives His Presence, or

[8] The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent, and App.

Himself; as St. Augustine says, "Believe, and thou hast eaten[9]." The word "spiritually," against which some have excepted, as though it were opposed to "really," is the very word of St. Augustine: "Eat[1] Life, drink Life; thou wilt have life; yet is Life entire. But then will this be, *i. e.* the Body and Blood of Christ will be life to each, if what in the Sacrament is visibly taken, in very truth is spiritually eaten, is spiritually drunk." "We[2] too at this day do receive visible food: but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another. How many receive from the altar and die, yea, by receiving, die! Whence the Apostle saith, 'Eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.' It was not that the sop of the Lord was poison to Judas. And yet he received: and when he received, the enemy entered into him: not that he received an evil thing, but that he being evil did in evil wise receive what was good. Look to it, then, brethren, eat ye spiritually the heavenly bread, bring innocence to the altar."

And this which is called either the substance (res) or the virtue (virtus) of the Sacrament, is explained to be the Body of Christ. "The sacrifice[3] of the Church con-

[9] Hom. 25 in S. Joh. § 12. This statement has been excepted against in recent controversy, but is found in later writers also. Thus Alex. Alensis:—"To complete feeding, there is required, a threefold union, by nature, knowledge, charity. Union by nature [*i. e.* having the same nature as our Incarnate Lord] renders man capable thereof; union by love completes that aptness as relates to spiritual feeding; union by knowledge, as to sacramental. Wherefore it must be said, that as he who hath not charity, in no wise feedeth spiritually; so he who in no wise hath knowledge, *i. e.* of faith, doth not sacramentally. Wherefore not every wickedness taketh away the feeding sacramentally, but that which is of defect of faith. Defect of faith, I mean, which is complete, whether with love or without it. Since then all the good have love, but all the bad are not wholly without faith, therefore it does not follow, although all the good eat spiritually, that all the bad [? do not] eat sacramentally." iv. qu. xi. memb. 2. art. 2. § 2.

[1] Hom. in N. T. Serm. 131. [2] Tract. 26 in S. Joh. § 11.

[3] Lanfranc. c. Berengar. quoted Decr. de consecr. d. 2. c. 48, as St. Augustine's. The same distinction between the "Sacramentum" and the "*res* et virtus Sacramenti," occurs in a prayer of Aquinas, received into the Præparatio ad Missam in the Roman Missal and Breviary.

sists of two things, the visible form of the elements, and the invisible Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; the Sacrament and the substance of the Sacrament, that is, the Body of Christ. The sacrifice of the Church consists of the sacrament and the substance (re) of the Sacrament, *i. e.* the Body of Christ. There is, then, the Sacrament and the substance of the Sacrament, *i. e.* the Body of Christ."

This very statement is the basis of the distinction between "eating sacramentally" and "eating spiritually," *i. e.* the wicked, who receive "the sacrament" only, are said to eat sacramentally only; the good, who receive "the substance of the Sacrament" also, eat spiritually also.

St. Jerome again uses the same language[4]: "The Blood and Flesh of Christ are understood in a twofold way: either that spiritual and Divine, of which He Himself said, 'My flesh is Meat indeed, and My Blood is Drink indeed;' and 'Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you:' or that Flesh and Blood, which was crucified and shed by the soldier's lance."

But again on this subject also, the statement of Mr. Palmer so fully expresses my own belief, and that, mostly in words supported by our formularies, that, with the exception of one inference, I would willingly once more adopt it. The single inference is (as I understand it), that, in the case "of the wicked, who are totally devoid of true and living faith," God withdraws the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. This seems to resemble the opinion mentioned by Aquinas as held by some, that "the Body of Christ is not in real truth received by sinners, for that the Body of Christ ceased to be present under the elements, so soon as touched by the sinner's lips."

This is a great mystery, and, as a mystery, I should prefer to leave it, as I have never spoken of it. The heading of our Article is, "Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ;" in the body of the Article it is said that they "are in no wise partakers of Christ." Certainly, one who partakes

[4] In Eph. l. 7, quoted de consecr. ii. 49.

unworthily, and to his condemnation, cannot be "partaker of Christ." Else they would "dwell in Christ and Christ in them, be one with Christ and Christ with them." And then, our Lord says, they would have everlasting life. But Christ dwelleth not in the soul in which Satan dwelleth. Nor yet can the Body and Blood of Christ be present without Him; for where His Body is, there He is. It is the very test of the reprobate, that the Spirit of Christ dwelleth not in them; and if the Spirit of Christ is not in them, they are none of His. In the words of Origen,—"Many[5] things may be spoken also concerning the Word itself, which was made Flesh and true Food, Whom whosoever eateth shall certainly live to eternity, Whom no wicked man can eat. For if it could be that he that still remains a sinner should eat the Word and the Bread of Life, it would not have been written, "Whosoever eateth this bread shall live for ever!'"

The language of St. Augustine is still stronger than our Article, if doubtful words are omitted. "This[6], then, it is, to eat that meat and drink that drink; to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And therefore who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt doth neither eat His Flesh nor drink His Blood; but rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing."

And yet it must in some sense be the Body and Blood of Christ, since the very ground why those who profaned the Lord's Supper, "ate and drank damnation to themselves" is, according to Holy Scripture, that they did "not discern the Lord's Body." "They did not dis-

[5] Origen. in Matt. xv. vol. iii. p. 500. I use Bishop Beveridge's translation, on Art. 29.

[6] Hom. 26 in Joh. § 18, p. 412, Oxf. Tr. The words "spiritaliter," and "licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi," are bracketed by the Bened. Editors on the authority of the MSS., yet retained in the text on the authority of the editions. The same is quoted from him by his disciple S. Prosper, Sent. 139. "He who is at variance with Christ, neither eateth His Flesh nor drinketh His Blood, although he daily indifferently receive the sacrament of so great a thing to the judgment of his presumption."

tinguish the Lord's Body," *i. e.* says Cassian, "no[7] way severing that heavenly food from the cheapness of common food, nor distinguishing it to be such that none may presume to receive it, save with pure mind and body." And St. Chrysostom, "'*Not*[8] *discerning the Lord's Body*,' *i. e.* not searching, not bearing in mind, as he ought, the greatness of the things set before him; not estimating the weight of the gift. For if thou shouldest come to know accurately Who it is that lies before thee, and Who He is that gives Himself, and to whom, thou wilt need no other argument; but this is enough for thee to use all vigilance, unless thou shouldest be altogether fallen."

And St. Augustine himself calls it, as to them also, the Lord's Body, "As[9] Judas, to whom the Lord gave the sop, by ill-receiving, not by receiving an ill thing, gave in himself place to the devil; so each, receiving unworthily the Sacrament of the Lord, doth not cause that, because he is bad, it should be bad, or that, because he doth not receive to salvation, he receiveth nothing. For it was still the Body of the Lord and the Blood of the Lord to those to whom the Apostle said, 'He who eateth unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.'"

And this he again expresses: "that[1] we eat not the Flesh and Blood of Christ only in the Sacrament, which thing do also many evil men; but that even unto participation of the Spirit we do eat and drink, that in the Lord's Body we abide as members, that with His Spirit we be quickened, and be not offended; yea, though many in this present time do together with us eat and drink temporally the Sacraments, who shall have in the end eternal torments."

This, then, I leave as a mystery, that while "they are in no wise partakers of Christ," they still receive to their condemnation "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." And for myself, I suppose that the Article, when it says in the heading, that "the wicked eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Sup-

[7] Collat. 22. c. 4.
[8] Hom. 28, § 2.
[9] De Bapt. c. Donat. v. 8, quoted de Consecr. ii. 68.
[1] Tr. in Joh. § 4.

per," uses the word "eat" in the same sense as our Lord Himself, when He repeats so often: "This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: and the Bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life. . . . He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, even He shall live by Me. He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever[2]." It is plain that the wicked, in this sense, do not "eat the Body of Christ," whatever it be that they receive to their condemnation. Else they would "live by Christ." This being the meaning of the word in Holy Scripture, it is obviously the meaning to be ascribed to it in the Articles. And thus the words in the heading of the Article, mean the same as those in the Article of which they are the heading. For "not to eat beneficially of the Body of Christ" is the same as "not to be partakers of Christ." I would gladly make the rest of Mr. Palmer's statement again[3] my own.

"Her[4] doctrine concerning the true presence appears to be limited to the following points:—

"Taking as her immoveable foundation the words of Jesus Christ: 'This[5] is My Body; . . This is My Blood of the new covenant;' and 'Whoso[6] eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath

2 St. John vi. 50, 51. 53, 54. 56, 57, 58.

3 I adopted it before, in the Appendix to my Sermon on the Holy Eucharist.

4 Treatise of the Church, vol. i. chap. vii. p. 526.

5 Matt. xxvi. 26. 28.

6 John vi. 54. The Church of England believes these expressions to relate to the Eucharist. "Then we spiritually eat the *Flesh* of Christ and drink His Blood," &c.—Exhort. in Communion Office. "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son," &c.—Prayer before Consecration. The term "flesh" is only used in this chapter of S. John.

eternal life;' she believes, that the Body or Flesh, and the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and Man, united indivisibly in One Person [7], are verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper [8], under the outward sign or 'form [9] of bread and wine,' which is, on this account, the 'partaking or communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.' She believes that the Eucharist is not the sign [1] of an *absent* body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure [2], or shadow, or sign of Christ's Body, but the reality itself. And, as Christ's Divine and Human Natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive

[7] "Who although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; . . . one altogether, not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person."—Athan. Creed.

[8] "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper . . . is received and eaten in the Supper."—Art. XXVIII. "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."—Catechism. "The Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ."—Exhort. in Communion Office. "We spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood."—Ibid. "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body."—Prayer before Consecration. "Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His Most Blessed Body and Blood."—Consecration. "Most heartily thank Thee for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us . . . with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."—Post Communion.

[9] "The outward sign or *form*."—Catechism. "Hereafter shall follow sermons . . . of the due receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood under the *form* of bread and wine."—Advertisement at the end of the first book of Homilies.

[1] 1 Cor x. 16. Art. XXVIII. "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent."—Hom. xxvii. p. 1.

[2] The faithful "receive not only the outward Sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure but the truth; not the shadow only, but the body."—Ib. Bishop Poynet says, "Corpus Christi et veritas et figura est: veritas dum Corpus Christi et sanguis virtute Spiritûs Sancti in virtute ipsius ex panis et vini substantia efficitur: figura vero est id quod exterius sentitur."—Diallacticon, p. 6.

in the Eucharist, not only the Flesh[3] and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, both God and Man. Resting on these words, 'The bread which we break is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?' and again, 'I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine:' she holds that the nature[4] of the bread and wine continues after consecration, and therefore rejects transubstantiation, or '*the* change[5] of the substance,' which supposes the nature of bread entirely to cease by consecration. As a necessary consequence of the preceding truths, and admonished by Christ Himself, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life;' she holds that the Presence (and therefore the eating) of Christ's Body and Blood, though true, is altogether 'heavenly[6] and spiritual,' of a kind which is inexplicable by any carnal or earthly experience or imagination: even as the Sonship of the Eternal Word of God, and His Incarnation, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit, are immeasurable by human understandings.

"Believing according to the Scriptures, that Christ ascended[7] in His natural Body into Heaven, and shall only come from thence at the end of the world; she rejects, for this reason, as well as the last, any such real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood as is cor-

[3] "He hath given *His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ*, not only to die for us, but also *to be our spiritual food and sustenance* in that Holy Sacrament."—Exhortation in Communion Office. "In no wise are they partakers of Christ."—Art. XXIX.

[4] "The sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances."—Declaration at end of Communion Office. "If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent."—See Rubric in same. "The terrene and earthly creatures which remain."—Hom. xxvii. p. 1. "The bread which we break," &c.—Art. XXVIII.

[5] "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," &c.—Art. XXVIII.

[6] "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an Heavenly and spiritual manner."—Art. XXVIII.

[7] "He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."—Athan. Creed.

poral[8] or organical, that is, according to the known and earthly mode of existence of a body. Resting on the Divine promise, 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life,' she regards it as the more pious[9] and probable opinion, that the wicked, those who are totally devoid of true and living faith, do not partake of the Holy Flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, God withdrawing from them so 'divine[1]' a gift, and not permitting His enemies to partake of it. And hence she holds, that such a faith is 'the means by which the Body of Christ is received and eaten,' 'a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies;' because it is the essential qualification on our parts, without which that Body is not received; and because 'without faith it is impossible to please God[2].'

"Following the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, and supported by their authority, she believes that 'the blessing[3]' or 'consecration[4]' of the bread and wine is not without effect, but that it operates a real change; for when the Sacrament is thus

[8] "No adoration is intended or ought to be done . . . unto any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."—Declar. after Communion Office.

[9] "The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth . . . the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ."—Art. XXIX.

[1] "Which being so *divine* and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily."—Exhort. in Com. Office.

[2] Hom. xxvii. p. 1. Art. XXVIII. Bossuet says, "that this assertion of the Article is certainly true, provided the reception be understood of a *useful* reception in the sense of St. John speaking of Jesus Christ: 'His own received Him not,' though He was in the midst of them; *i. e.* they did not receive His doctrine nor His grace."—Variat. x. sect. vi.

[3] "Beginning at 'our Saviour Christ,' &c. for the *blessing* of the bread, and at 'likewise after supper,' &c. for the *blessing* of the cup."—Rubric in Com. Office.

[4] "The Priest . . . shall say the prayer of *consecration*."—Rubric Com. Office. "If the *consecrated* bread and wine be all spent . . . the Priest is to *consecrate* more."—Rubric, ibid. "If any remain of that which was *consecrated* . . . the Priest, and such other, &c. . . . shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."—Rubric, ibid.

perfected, she regards it as so 'divine a thing,' so 'heavenly a food,' that we must not '*presume*[5]' to approach it with unprepared minds, and that sinners, although they only partake of the bread and wine, partake of them to their own *condemnation*[6], because they impiously disregard the Lord's Body, which is truly present in that Sacrament. Hence it is that the Church believing firmly in the real Presence of the 'precious[7] and Blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ,' speaks of the Eucharist as 'high[8] and holy mysteries,' exhorts us to consider the 'dignity of that holy mystery[9],' that 'heavenly feast,' that 'holy Table, 'the[1] banquet of that most Heavenly food,' even 'the King of kings' Table[2].'"

But as to the *mode* of the Presence, following the Divines of our Church, and, as I believe, the Fathers of the Church, I have never thought, or rather I have withheld my thoughts. To repeat now, words which I used as appealing to the Church of England from the judgments of those who had power here: "My[3] own belief was cast (so to speak) in the mould of the minds of Bishop Andrewes and Archbishop Bramhall, which I regarded as the type of the teaching of our Church. From them originally, and with them, I learnt to receive in their literal sense, our Blessed Lord's solemn words, 'This is My Body,' and from them, while I believe the consecrated elements to become, by virtue

5 "Which being . . . so dangerous to them that will *presume* to receive it unworthily."—Exhort. in Com. Off. "St. Paul exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they *presume* to eat of that bread and drink of that cup."—Ibid. "We do not *presume* to come to this Thy Table, merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies."—Prayer before Consecration.

6 "So is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour: we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's Body; we kindle God's wrath against us; we provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death."—Exhort. in Com. Office.

7 Prayer before Consecration. Post Communion Prayer.

8 Exhort. Com. Office. Hom. xxvii. p. 1.

9 Ibid. [1] Ibid. [2] Hom. xxvii. p. 1.

3 Preface to Serm. on Holy Eucharist, p. 4.

of His consecrating words, truly and really, yet spiritually and in an ineffable way, His Body and Blood, I learnt also to withhold my thoughts as to the *mode* of this great mystery, but 'as a Mystery' to 'adore it.' With the Fathers then and our own great Divines, (explaining, as I believe, the true meaning of our Church,) I could not but speak of the consecrated elements, as being, what, since He has so called them, I believe them to become, His Body and Blood; and I feared not, that, using their language, I should, when speaking of Divine and 'spiritual' things, be thought to mean otherwise than 'spiritually,' or having disclaimed all thoughts as to the *mode* of their being, that any should suppose I meant a *mode* which our Church disallows."

I have then, in my adapted books, retained the words "under the form of Bread and Wine," because they are the words used in the Homilies, "of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood under the *form* of Bread and Wine." I have meant them in the same sense in which the Homilies use them, and have used them because they were there used. I have never taught any thing physical, corporeal, carnal, but spiritual, sacramental, Divine, ineffable. And when I have said, as I could not but acknowledge, that I could not see how the Roman Catholics could mean less by "the accidents of bread and wine" than we by the substance, this was not to draw our doctrine to theirs but theirs to ours. If it be granted, as they must grant, that all the natural properties remain, size, form, solidity, the same distribution of particles, whereof the elements are composed, the same natural powers of nourishment or exhilaration, the same effect upon the nervous system and every other physical property, I do not know what remains, which we mean to affirm and they to deny. But I have said this, not as adopting their mode of explanation, which is not acknowledged by the Greek Church any more than by our own; but as hoping that our differences were not irreconcilable, and that *we* are condemning a popular physical interpretation, which *they* cannot consistently hold. I mention this because I have acknowledged this, when

consulted. I have said that it appears from our Article itself, that it condemns Transubstantiation, in the sense of implying a physical change. This appears from the words, "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," *i. e.* in that it entitles the consecrated element, "bread[4];" "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," in that a Sacrament is "a sign of a sacred thing," and on this view, the sign would be the thing itself. If any imply not a physical change, the Article does not apply to them.

I may give here Archdeacon Wilberforce's recent summary, premising only that, in justice to him, the whole note, which contains the ground of it, ought to be studied[5].

"The questions of most real moment upon this subject" ["our Lord's Sacramental Presence"] "would seem to be—first, Whether our Lord is truly present, as is affirmed in this work, or whether the transaction is a mere appeal to our imagination? Secondly, If our Lord be truly present, is it under those conditions in which He is an object to the senses of men, *i. e.* as above defined, materially, or in some other manner? The Church of England, in denying Transubstantiation, means apparently to deny a *material* presence, for she explains the subject by saying that there is no 'Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood:' and she states, as her ground for this assertion, that 'the truth of Christ's natural body' requires it to be in one

[4] "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

[5] Doctrine of the Incarnation, Ed. 3, note on ex. p. 543 sqq. It may here be briefly said, that the groundwork of the passage is the entirely distinct meaning of the words "matter" and "material," "substance" and "substantial," "as used by those who adopt the Baconian, and those who adopt the Aristotelian habits of thought." "The Baconian" (and such is our popular language) "will speak of that which is *material* in man as equivalent with that which the senses can discern; or he will define matter to be that of which our senses are fitted to take cognizance." The Aristotelian means by "substance," "an abstract notion which the intellect obtains by disregarding those accidents, by which one individual of a class is distinguished from others." "The ideas," thus, "have no relation to one another."

place; *i. e.* that it is subject to these conditions, which render it a suitable object for the senses of mortals. She means to deny, therefore, that our Lord's natural body is in such sort present as that we should discern those things of which we partake to be flesh and blood, were not the senses of men supernaturally withholden from discerning a glorified body. How far it is correct to say that this notion is affirmed by others, it forms no part of the present work to inquire."

On the subject of the Adoration of our Lord at the Holy Eucharist, I have simply, I believe, on one occasion, retained the words, "Adore Him with profound reverence." I had disclaimed "language[6] on this great mystery, implying (to speak reverently) a local confinement and humiliation of Him Who vouchsafes to feed us with Himself, which the Fathers would not, certainly do not, use." I fully accept the words of the Rubric at the end of our Communion Service, that "no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal [*i. e.* Physical, Carnal] Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); [this would be acknowledged by Roman Catholics themselves;] and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

I have explained the word "Corporal" by "carnal" or "physical," because the framers of this rubric deliberately rejected the denial of the words "real and essential," which stood in the first articles under Edward VI., and substituted the word "corporal." "For a real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist," says Wheatly, "is what our Church frequently asserts in this very office of Communion, in her Articles, in her Homilies, and her Catechism." But the statement, that "Christ's

[6] Advertisement to Paradise for the Christian Soul, p. vii.

Natural Body is in Heaven, not on earth," is the received doctrine, not of schoolmen only, but even of the Council of Trent. And so far from the Sacramental Presence of our Lord at all implying any Natural Presence of His Body, Divines even of the Roman Church have ruled that it even excludes it. "From the nature of the thing," says Lugo[7], "the Sacramental Presence of Christ does not require any Natural Presence of Christ." And he assigns as a reason the very reason assigned in the Rubric, "any definitive adequate Presence implies, that the subject is in such wise there *as not to be elsewhere;* therefore the Sacramental Presence of Christ doth not in itself require the Natural Presence; yea, rather it in itself requireth that Christ hath not any other presence than that."

It is matter of faith that the Natural Body of our Lord is at the Right Hand of God "circumscribed" in place, "in a certain place of Heaven," says St. Augustine[8], "on account of the mode of a true Body." "Doubt[9] not," he says, "that the Man Christ Jesus is now there, whence He shall come; and hold in memory and keep faithfully the Christian profession, 'He rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the Right Hand of the Father, and shall' not 'come' from any place than 'thence to judge both quick and dead.' And He shall so come, as the Angels' words testify, as He was seen to go into heaven, *i. e.* in the same form and substance of the flesh to which He gave immortality, but took not away its nature. According to this Form, He is not to be thought to be diffused every where. For we must beware that we do not so establish the Divinity of the Man as to take away the flesh of His Body. For it followeth not, that that which is in God is every where in such wise as God is. God and Man are One Person, and Both is One Christ Jesus; every where by that which is God, in heaven by that which is Man." Whence Alexander

7 De Sacr. Euch. Disp. v. sect. 8.

8 Ep. 187 ad Dard. § 41.

9 Ib. § 10. Hugo de S. Victore extracts from this Epistle his de Sacr. l. 2, p. 1, c. 13.

Alensis [1] says, that "Christ, according to His Human Nature is *locally in heaven*, personally in the Word, sacramentally on the Altar." He allows also that "these [2] two things must be conceded, that Christ as circumscribed or locally, is contained in heaven; He is *not* contained, as circumscribed or locally under the Sacrament." And Aquinas allows the other argument of the Rubric, "No [3] body can be in several places at once; this does not belong even to an angel; for by the same reason it might be every where. But the Body of Christ is a true body, and is in heaven." His answer is, "That [4] the Body of Christ is not in that manner in this Sacrament, as a body in place, which in its dimensions is commensurate with place; but in a certain special manner, proper to this Sacrament. Whence we say that the Body of Christ is on different altars, not as in different places, but as in the Sacrament. Whereby we do not mean that Christ is there only as in a sign, although the Sacrament is in the nature of a sign; but we understand that the Body of Christ is here, according to the mode proper to this Sacrament." And again, he speaks of "the [5] presence of the Body of Christ, as it is spiritually, *i. e.* invisibly, and by the virtue of His Spirit," which he contrasts with the way in which "it is present by the mode of a body, *i. e.* in its visible form." But this Presence, which is not circumscribed, not local, not after the mode of a body, but spiritual only and Sacramental, is, so far, no other than our Divines have contended for. The Council of Trent itself (as I said) asserts, that "our Saviour [6] Himself always sits on the Right Hand of the Father, according to the *natural* mode of being," and asserts only that "He is *sacramentally* present with us in many other places with His substance, in that manner of being, which although we can scarcely express in words, we can still, with thought enlightened by faith attain, as possible to God, and ought most firmly to believe." Would that they had left it thus not expressed by words, and that both

[1] De Sacr. Euch. qu. 10. memb. 7. art. 3. § 7.
[2] Ib. Resol. p. 358. [3] p. 3. q. 75. art. 1. n. 3.
[4] Ib. ad 3. [5] Ib. ad 4. [6] Sess. 13 de Euch. c. 1.

might have received with reverence the ineffable Presence of our Lord, to be our Food, and thus "to dwell in us and we in Him, be one with us and we with Him," without defining the mode!

It was in this way that I thought of the Adoration of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, in the words which I have quoted, not as confined or contained in place, much less so as to involve any worship of the consecrated elements. But believing Him to be present, I believed, with the Ancient Church, that He was to be adored as Present. It is the well-known saying of St. Augustine, "*No one* eateth that flesh, unless he have first adored[7]." "The[8] rich also have adored the body of the humility of their Lord; they are not, like the poor, satisfied, so as to imitate Him, yet they have worshipped." I cannot think that these words, any more than those of St. Chrysostom, which are adduced controversially, imply any local adoration; I had no such thought in my mind. But, believing that He was then in an especial manner present, I could not but think that we knelt, not only as receiving so great a Gift, but in reverence for His Presence. "Think," says St. Chrysostom[9], "with what honour thou hast been honoured, what Table thou enjoyest. What the angels tremble when they behold, and do not even dare fearlessly to gaze on, on account of the flash of brightness streaming forth thence; with This are we nourished, with This are we commingled, and become the one body and one flesh of Christ."

Let me quote the words of three unsuspected writers in our Church:

"The[1] second is an act of adoration and reverence, when he looks upon that good hand, that hath conse-

[7] In Ps. xcviii. § 9. Roman Catholic controversialists supply "adored *it*." But St. Augustine is simply interpreting the words of Psalm xxii. 26. 29 of the Holy Eucharist. "The poor shall eat and be satisfied." "All such as be fat upon earth have eaten and worshipped." There is no ground to supply "*It*," in St. Augustine's words, since it may not be supplied in the Psalm itself, which St. Augustine is explaining.

[8] On Ps. xxi. Enarr. 1.

[9] In S. Matt. Hom. 82 (al. 83) § 5.

[1] Dr. Brevint, quoted in the Bishop of Oxford's Eucharistica, p. 157.

crated for the use of the Church, the memorial of these great things. Since, by the special appointment of my God, these representatives are brought in hither for this Church, and among the rest for me, I must mind what Israel did when the cloud filled the tabernacle. I will not fail to worship God as soon as these sacraments and Gospel-clouds appear in the sanctuary. Neither the ark, nor any clouds, were ever adored in Israel, but sure it is, the ark was considered quite otherwise than an ordinary chest, and the cloud than a vapour, as soon as God had hallowed them to be the signs of His Presence. Therefore, as the former people did never see the temple or the cloud, but that presently at that sight they used to throw themselves on their faces, so I will never behold these better and surer Sacraments of the glorious mercies of God, but as soon as I see them used in the Church to that holy purpose that Christ hath consecrated them to, I will not fail to remember my Saviour, whom these Sacraments do represent."

"If[2] Christ be in a special and mysterious manner present in these 'holy mysteries,' as the infinite majority of Christians have at all times firmly and fervently believed, according to the more simple and unrestrained interpretation of Holy Scripture; the truly religious man cannot but be profoundly impressed with sentiments of awe and veneration in the more immediate Presence of the Divine Saviour of the world. He will feel with the patriarch: How dreadful is this place! 'this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.' Nor will he need the voice of God to say: 'Put off thy shoes from thy feet: for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' Now there is every reason to believe, that of those who intended their worship at the elevation[3] to be directed to

[2] Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 314.

[3] Mr. Palmer is vindicating the Church of Rome as a Church, from the charge of idolatry founded on the elevation of the Host. I have quoted these words in Illustration only, how he conceives that adoration *at* the sacrament may be simply directed "to Christ Himself." This is, of course, quite unconnected with the practice of the elevation, which is not here in question.

Christ, as more immediately Present in the Holy Eucharist; many directed it simply to *Christ Himself*, and not to the external part of the Sacrament, whether substance or species."

The third, one of our greatest names, Bishop Andrewes, I will give as quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, from whom I take it. I give the introductory words as fully as I can here, although, to do him justice, the whole context ought to be studied.

"In respect, then, to the two points which have been especial subjects of discussion, it may be said, first, that the Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood is not a material presence; that, so far as Christ's Body is a fitting object for the senses, or a natural body, it is in Heaven. This is understood to be the truth asserted by the Church of England, when she denies the doctrine of Transubstantiation; she is using the term substantial as equivalent to material or natural, and not referring to any metaphysical sense which may be given to it. But, secondly, our Lord's Body and Blood, though not materially, are yet truly and really present in the consecrated elements. They are not present in place or by outline, as though His Body were a *mere* body, but by reason of those spiritual properties, which render His Flesh ζωοποιός, as S. Cyril expresses it, and which belong to it, because it is σῶμα πνευματικόν. So that, without adoring the elements, or recognising any corporal presence of Christ, men may fully concur in the words of Bishop Andrewes: 'Nos[4] vero, et in mysteriis Carnem Christi adoramus, cum Ambrosio: et non id sed eum, qui super altare colitur. Nec Carnem manducamus, quin adoremus prius cum Augustino. Et sacramentum tamen nulli adoramus.'"

[4] Responsio ad Apol. Bellarm. p. 195. Bishop Andrewes had said just before, "Christ Himself the Substance [res] of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, is wherever He is, to be adored. But the king [James, whom he was defending] laid down that Christ truly present in the Eucharist, is also truly to be adored, *i. e.* the substance of the Sacrament; but not the Sacrament, *i. e.* the earthly part, as Irenæus; the visible, as Augustine."

IV. "By your introduction of Roman Catholic books adapted to the use of our Church."

On this subject I recollect that your Lordship made observations in a charge some years ago, although I recollect (but I forget on what ground) that I thought that your observations related to one in your Lordship's Diocese, rather than to myself. I may own, perhaps, that I thought that your Lordship was hardly acquainted with the class of minds for whom those books were intended, as I, from circumstances, was; and that you could not know to how great an extent Roman Catholic books of devotion, morals, religious biography, on the spiritual life, doctrine, and, perhaps, more than all, controversy, are circulated among our people. At the very time that I was preparing my plan for the publication of translated books, "adapted for the use of the English Church," I heard that there was another plan of the same kind on foot to publish similar works unadapted. Those who had formed it made way for mine, and abandoned their own [5]. In early days, I had seen Massillon, Bourdaloue, Fléchier, admitted into private gentlemen's libraries; and Dean Stanhope's "adaptation" of Parson's Directory, as well as of Thomas à Kempis, were among our household books of devotional reading. Part of the "Spiritual Combat" had been translated and "adapted" to our use by an earlier and well-known author, Dr. Lucas.

There was a craving awakened which could not be supplied at once; and if it was left unsupplied, would supply itself in works, in which, combined with so much which is good and holy, devout and instructive, there were other elements, which, as an English

[5] Surin's "Foundations of a Spiritual Life" came in this way into my hands. I should hardly have ventured, upon my own responsibility, to publish a book aiming at such total self-abnegation.

Churchman, I did not receive, nor could wish to be introduced among us.

I thought certainly, and still for myself think, that there is no ground why we should not borrow from the rest of the Western Church works of piety or devotion, so far as they do not clash with the principles of our own. Nor do I see that it is necessarily immodest for an individual Priest and Minister of God's Word to employ, as to a private book of devotion, the principles upon which the compilers of our Prayer-Book acted as to the Breviary and Missal. Apart from the mode of execution, it seems to me nothing intrinsically wrong, that one individual should undertake for private use, what a number of individuals did for the whole Church. The Prayer Book is an adaptation of the Breviary and Missal, and in the special services, of other books "for the use of the English Church;" the Compilers freely employed the materials before them, translating them freely, combining, altering them at times, according to a certain standard. I am not now saying that I succeeded in what I attempted, although I do think that "The Spiritual Combat" and "The Paradise for the Christian Soul" are treasures of spiritual experience and devotion. I mean only, that I did not see any thing in what I did, different in principle from the compilation of the English Prayer Book, or from earlier or more recent attempts of individuals, as Dr. Lucas and Dean Stanhope.

My wish was to publish, from those writers whom God had raised up as lights of the Church in different countries, works in different portions of practical or devotional theology, which might so far make a whole, and supply in a form, adapted to the children of our Church, what they needed. It seems to me, that it would cast no slur upon our English divines, if we added to them, from Portugal, Father Thomas, on the Passion of our Lord; or from Spain, the practical wisdom of Rodriguez and Louis of Granada; or the meditations of De Ponte; or from Italy, "the Spiritual Combat;" and "the Paradise of the Christian Soul," from Belgium; or from France, St. François de Sales, or the self-examinations of Tronson, &c. It could not, I thought, be

construed into a derogation of our own writers, if I endeavoured to reunite with them some of the most eminent of those whom, in other parts of our Western Christendom, God had employed to teach His people holiness and the love of Himself.

Indeed, books of the Roman Church have been published or "adapted" for the use of our people at different times ever since the Reformation. Prynne, in his charges against Laud, mentions that S. François de Sales' "Introduction to a Devout Life" had been, about 1622, "translated [6] into English by a Protestant [Laud says [7] "Dr. James"], who left out all the Popery and superstition couched therein, reserving only what was orthodox and pious, which was licensed for the Presse and printed by Nicholas Oakes." So then in this "adapted" form, it received a Bishop's licence. Prynne's charge against Laud is, that the Archbishop's Chaplain, Dr. Haywood, licensed, not the "adapted" but the unadapted form of it, the previous translation by a Jesuit J. Y. about 1637. Dr. Haywood had previously been examined before the Star Chamber as to this book; his defence was that he had "adapted" it, and that the re-publication of the original translation, was a trick of the printer "to work mischief," Laud says, "to my chaplain and myself." This adaptation is mentioned also in the Proclamation, which Laud "caused [8] His Majesty to publish," recalling the book.

Prynne also objected to Laud the licensing [9] of "The Epistle of Christ to a devout soul" by Lanspergius, which Laud answers, was "licensed [1] at London House by Dr. Weeks," Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

In this short account by Prynne, we have the Bishops and Archbishops sanctioning the adaptation of Roman books.

Before the close of the preceding century, in 1598, a work of Father Luis of Granada was published under the title "Granados Spiritual and heavenlie Exercises," and "an exposition of Psalm 51, Englished

[6] Canterburie's Doom, p. 187.

[7] Hist. of Troubles and trial of Archbishop Laud, p. 363. "He had corrected Sales in all Popish points before he licensed it."

[8] Prynne, l. c. [9] p. 188. [1] p. 362.

by Francis Meres, Master of Artes of both Universities, and Student in Divinitie."

In his preface to the former he thus speaks:—"I present these divine and celestiall meditations which may doe as much good in England as they have done in Spayne, Portugall, Italy, Fraunce, and Germanie. Lodovicus Granatensis, the author of these heavenlie and spyrituall meditations, hath so cunningly pourtrayed in this Treatise the myseris and calamities of this lyfe, and with such divine eloquence depainted the future blessedness of the other, that for stile hee seems to mee another Cicero, and for sound and emphaticall persuasion a second Paule. Whose divine spirit and heavenly writing as it hath moved the Italians . . . to translate his works into theyr language, and Michael of Isselt to convert them into Latine, and Ph. Doberniner into the Germaine tongue, so also hath it moved me to digest them into English, that now at the length our country might enjoy that rare jewel which those famous countries doe so highly prize."

In Laud's own time, A.D. 1633, the fourth edition of another work of Granada's was published under the title, "A Paradise of Prayers containing the purity of devotion and meditation, gathered out of all the spirituall exercises of Lewes of Granado; and englished for the benefit of the Christian reader." (1633). 4th Ed.

In the preface, the translator says, "the godly meditations and prayers of that learned and religious divine Lewes de Granado, were long since devested from their Spanish habit, for their efficacy and excellency, suted in our English attire, and for the benefit of God's children and servants, received and layd up into the Sanctuary and treasury of our Church, not as a popish relique, but as a precious jewell of inestimable price and valew; so that for any ignorant or overcurious or carping Christian any way to question eyther the worth of this reverend author, or the validity of these his pious and elegant labours, it is directly to quarrell with the truth, and maliciously to deny the brightness and clarity of the Sunne when he is in his hottest meridian and in the Verticall poynt of his most resplendent lustre and glory." He speaks also of

"the former impressions of this booke, having received favourable applause of all religious and zealous spirits."

Another translation, about the same time, unites three names, at all times held in love or reverence or esteem among us: the one, as a glowing and devout Christian poet; the second, for his devout life; the third, as a Divine—George Herbert, Nicolas Farrer, and Dr. Thomas Jackson. It was printed at Oxford in 1638, at Cambridge in 1646. George Herbert thus writes of it to Mr. Farrer, who had translated it:—

"My dear and deserving brother,—Your Valdesso I now return with many thanks, and some notes, in which perhaps you will discover some care, which I forbear not in the midst of my griefs: first, for your sake, because I would do nothing negligently that you commit unto me: secondly, for the author's sake, whom I conceive to have been a true servant of God; and to such, and all that is theirs, I owe diligence: thirdly, for the Church's sake, to whom by printing it, I would have you consecrate it.

"You owe the Church a debt, and God hath put this into your hands (as He sent the fish with money to St. Peter) to discharge it: haply also with us (as His thoughts are fruitful) intending the honour of His servant the author, who being obscured in his own country, He would have to flourish in this land of light and region of the Gospel, among His chosen.

"It is true there are some things which I like not in him, as my fragments will express, when you read them: nevertheless I wish you by all means to publish it, for these three eminent things observable therein. 1. That God in the midst of popery should open the eyes of one to understand and express so clearly and excellently the intent of the Gospel, in the acceptation of Christ's righteousness (as he sheweth through all his considerations) a thing strangely buried and darkened by the adversaries, and their great stumbling-block.

"2. The great honour and reverence which he every where bears towards our dear Master and Lord, concluding every consideration almost with His holy Name, and setting His merit forth

so piously; for which I do so love him, that were there nothing else, I would print it, that with it the honour of my Lord might be published.

"3. The many pious rules of ordering our life, about mortification, and observation of God's kingdom within us, and the working thereof, of which he was a very diligent observer.

"These three things are very eminent in the author, and overweigh the defects, as I conceive, towards the publishing thereof."

"From Bemerton, near Salisbury, September 29, 1632[2]."

Dr. Jackson "being desired by the Vice-Chancellor to peruse it, and give a censure of it," writes "I cannot but much approve and commend the greatest part of it, as very worthy of this press and a Christian's reading. There be some passages obscure, dubious, and offensive, wherein notwithstanding the publisher has given me satisfaction, and I doubt not but his annotations in the Preface, together with Mr. Herberts apologie for the offensive places, will do the like to every unprejudicated and impartiall Christian reader." Thus recommended, it was published by the printer to the University. It is thus spoken of in a recent edition.

"Dr. Thomas Jackson.
Mr. Nicholas Farrer.
Mr. George Herbert.
All three holy in their lives, eminent in their gifts, signal protestants for their religion, painful in their several stations, precious in their deaths, and sweet in their memories.

"From these there may be learned, that Christian charity will keep unity of souls, amidst great differences of gifts and opinions Yet in this divinity had they such a harmony of souls as was admirable."

"As they were (too) all three admirable in separating from the vile what was precious in every sect or person."

"For instance, in one who differed in some points from them all, yet in him they so agreed all, as that Mr. Farrer out of a great liking of the man, translated him into English;—Mr. Herbert commented on him, and commended him

[2] pp. 101, 102.

to use;—and Dr. Jackson allowed him for the press. It was Valdesso's 110 Considerations." (Printed at Cambridge. 1646.) pp. xcvi. xcix. cviii. cix."

In the same century, nearly contemporaneously, a work of Nicole was translated and "adapted" by two laymen, Locke, and (as it has been conjectured) the pious philosopher, Robert Boyle. The fourth edition of the translation, which has been thought to have been published by Boyle under the title, "Moral essays on many important duties, written in French by Messieurs du Port Royal, and done into English by a person of quality," was published in 1724: that by Locke remained in MS. until 1828. A writer in the Christian Observer, in 1819, who first drew attention to Locke's translation, conjectured it to come from "that renowned school of sanctity and learning—Port Royal."

While writing this, I am reminded that Archdeacon Churton[3] has shown, that the substance of the "Contemplations on the State of Man," ascribed to Jeremy Taylor, A.D. 1684, is taken from the work of Nieremberg[4], a pious Spanish Jesuit. We have been, for nearly two centuries, reading this borrowed work as Bishop Taylor's. "Ten editions were sold in the next half century," while the original translation of it was forgotten. In 1654, had been published "two excellent discourses of, 1. Temperance and Patience; 2. Life and Death," written in Latin by Johan. Euseb. Nierembergius, Englished by Henry Vaughan, a poet and layman in South Wales.

"The Introduction to a devout life" was again published, in an "adapted" form, by Dr. Nicholl, A.D. 1700, as "translated and reformed." In his unsatisfactory notice "on the rise and

[3] Letter to Joshua Watson, Esq.

[4] His work was translated into Latin, A.D. 1654, at Madrid (Sotwel Bibl. Soc. Jes. p. 444,) seventeen years before Taylor's death. Archd. C., however, thinks that the "Contemplations" are taken from Sir Vivian Mullineaux' translation from the Spanish, "since revised by J. W.," A.D. 1672, five years after Taylor's death. The title would rather lead one to think that the translation had appeared before. Any how, in twelve years, a mistake may have arisen, so that we need not think the compiler a forger.

progress of spiritual books in the Romish Church," he remarks, as a good sign amid the decay of piety, that so many spiritual books had been published, both by our own writers and writers "abroad." He speaks of the favourable reception of these last among us; and his tone will show that he was not prejudiced in their favour. "Not only greater numbers of the Treatises upon those subjects wrote by our own Divines, have been published and bought up, but many others which were wrote abroad have been translated into English; and, notwithstanding the great and deserved aversion which this nation has to Popery, yet the Books of their Divines upon Devotional and practical subjects, have met with as favourable reception among us, as if the authors had been of a better religion."

He himself, in conclusion, gives not, indeed, the highest sort of praise to the book which he "adapted;" but still praises it, as far as he entered into it.

"The devotional pieces of our present authors [S. François de Sales], Kempis, Card. Bellarmine, &c., are wrote with discre ion as well as warmth: and, setting aside the points peculiar to their religion, may be very beneficial to Christian souls.

"As to Sales' Introduction, it must be said by every one who reads it, there are to be found a great many very excellent Christian rules for a good life, with many curious and uncommon reflections upon moral duties, and well-chosen arguments for the practice of them; and the style withal is so familiar, easy, and inviting, that I am of opinion few people can begin to read the book without going through with it. For the natural and pretty similes and apposite examples, together with a peculiar tenderness and good humour in the expression, are very entertaining. I think I have left nothing standing in this edition which is directly contrary to the Articles of our Church, and am of opinion it may now be used with safety and edification, and probably most people will be the better for reading it."

About the same time[5], Dr. Lucas, the admired au-

[5] The third part of his work, "Enquiry after human happiness." The edition of the "Spiritual Combat" must have been a work of

thor of the work on "religious perfection," "revised and recommended," a translation of the "Spiritual Combat," from its Spanish form, as attributed to John de Castaniza. He says of it, in a letter to the translator, "The book itself is writ with a spirit of true piety, and in a little compass, and a very good order, contains a great many excellent directions for the conquest of all inordinate appetites, and the attaining a true conformity to the Divine Will: I heartily wish it may meet with the success you aim at."

The translator says;—"There are many books wherein this Divine Wisdom is more largely taught; but the way of attaining being so briefly and familiarly comprised in this little book, it may be thought of more service to such as want either leisure or capacity to look over bigger volumes. This, with the desire of some friends, put me upon translating and printing a second relation of this little treatise, whereby I hope I have done the author no wrong, in any material part, though I have taken the liberty of leaving out, or altering some few places, that might otherwise have prejudiced a well-minded reader."

In 1707, Dr. Hickes edited two translations[6] of works on the education of young women, the one by Fénélon, the other by a M. de la Chétaney.

In 1701, he edited, "Devotions in the ancient way of offices, with Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers for every day in the week, and every holiday in the year, reformed by a person of quality, [Susannah Hopton]." This book, which had already been adapted by the Rev. T. Dorrington, and in that form, had passed through five editions, besides "divers others in stolen books of devotions," was originally a popular Roman Catholic book, having been published in four editions. The Book is formed, in a

his advanced life. The second edition, which he revised, was published in 1710. His earliest work was in 1677, his latest probably in 1717.

[6] Instructions for the Education of a daughter, by the Author of Telemachus; to which is added, a small tract of instructions for the Conduct of young ladies of the highest rank, [by M. de la Chétaney,] with Suitable devotions annexed. Done into English and revised by Dr. George Hickes. London, 1707.

degree, after the model of the Breviary, with Invitatories, Antiphons, Responsories, &c. Dr. Hickes lived to enlarge his preface in the fifth edition, 1717.

An unpublished treatise of Fénélon, on Christian Perfection, and other pieces, were translated at the end of the life of Bourbon, Prince of Conti (1711).

In 1720, John Ball, "late lecturer of St. Bartholomew's the Less," published the "Art of dying well, written originally in Latin by Card. Bellarmine."

In his preface he says; "I shall not distrust the reader's judgment so far, as to imagine that he will dislike the Book on the account of the Authour, and not rather consider *what* he has wrote upon the subject, than *who* it was that wrote it, and then I persuade myself that I shall have no occasion to make any apology for the publication of it. For a wise and a good man will be willing to receive instruction from whatsoever hand it comes. . . .

"Any pretence that there have been other excellent discourses publish'd on the same subject, I believe, can be no reasonable objection against this; because the contemplation of death may be very well manag'd by different authors, as the same prospect may be finely drawn by different hands.

"Wherever my Author goes off into the Romish innovations, I have attempted to give him another turn. I must further own that I have taken some liberty, where it was proper, to enlarge his thoughts."

His book is, perhaps, like Dean Stanhope's, rather a paraphrase than a translation, in which he inserts as well as omits, according to his own judgment. It is the more remarkable that he himself translates the rhythm of Aquinas, Adoro Te devote, latens Deitas. I may cite also a passage on confession, which is entirely his own.

"But[7] besides this Confession of sin to God, there is another kind of Confes-

7 L. 2. c. 6. He adds, c. 7, "Having recited this Hymn in the most devout manner, and made Confession of his sins to God; and having also received Absolution, and the blessing from the Priest, let the sick person, with all humility and reverence, make use of this, or the like expression, 'Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof;' and then, having received the Holy Communion, let him add, 'Into Thy Hands, O God, I commend my spirit.'"

sion also, which has been the constant practice of the Christian Church in all ages, and which is of singular benefit and advantage; and that is, to lay open the whole state and condition of the soul to the priest. This practice is of great service in many respects; in the 1st place, as it highly promotes the peace and quiet of men in thus unburthening their consciences; 2ndly, in that the Priest, by this means, is better informed of the spiritual necessities of men; and consequently that he is qualified to adapt his advice to them with more success. And, 3rdly, that the person so confessing, will be better qualified to receive the benefit of Absolution; for God, who has the first and only right of forgiving sins, hath deputed this power to His Ambassadors here, to pronounce this Absolution. St. Ambrose, in his comment on the 38th Psalm, says, 'that he that denies this power to the priest is no better than a Novatian.' St. Cyprian is entirely of the same opinion. This power is derived down from the Apostles, to whom it was first delegated, to their successors. The Original Commission is, 'Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' John xx. 23. Whosoever, therefore, assents to the doctrines of the Christian Church, or believes the authority of the Ancient Fathers, or the Word of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, cannot deny this power of the Priest; and if the power of Absolution be indisputable, and it be further certain, that God has entrusted him with the dispensation of so great a blessing; the inference from the whole is, that men should use the means which God has appointed, to ascertain that blessing to them."

In the bad times of the last century, Wesley, together with works of Fathers and Divines of the English Church, and Lutherans and Non-Conformists, still published in his "Christian Library" treatises from the Roman Church. Such are fourteen "Spiritual Letters," by Don Juan d'Avila; Molinos' "Spiritual Guide;" "Life of Gregory Lopez," by Father Francis Losa; "Fénélon on the Love of God," and that remarkable and beautiful

book, "Letters and conversations of Brother Lawrence," which has since been published separately[8].

Later still, in the present century, "Pascal's Thoughts" were published, with omissions (*i. e.* "adapted"), in Edinburgh[9]; and "Sermons" of Massillon, and selections from him[1], and "Thoughts" by him.

I have not mentioned à Kempis, because he has long been so domiciliated amongst us. But his name again carries back this principle of adaptation to the 16th century. The devout translator, in 1677, in speaking of previous translations, mentions one under Queen Elizabeth.

"In Queen Elizabeth's reign it was translated into English, and more than once published by Mr. Rogers, who dedicated it to the then Lord Chancellor Bromley."

He adds, "Of latter years the English editions have been more exact and perfect: those in London seem to have been according to the prints at Paris, except some short differences in a few places in the Three bookes, and the leaving out of some passages in the fourth book (and one passage in the first) which related to some customs and orders, or to some external rites in the Roman administration of the Eucharist."

In 1639, the translation was corrected and amended by William Page, Chaplain to Walter, Bishop of Winchester, dedicated to the Bishop, and printed by the Printer to the University of Oxford[2]. In his dedication he says,

"I must confesse to the glory of God and mine own comfort, that I have profitted more in the course of Christianity by the perusal

[8] Conversations and Letters of Brother Lawrence concerning the Presence of God, translated from the French. London: Hatchard and Son, 1824.

[9] By the Rev. Edw. Craig, 1835. He "does not hesitate to avow that he has withheld a few passages which occur occasionally on the subject of the peculiar tenets of the Romish Church."

[1] Selections from his works. Hatchard, 1826. "Select Sermons, translated from Massillon by Rutton Morris." Nisbet, 1830. The translator entitles himself, translator of Pensées de Massillon.

[2] The Imitation of Christ, written in Latin by Thomas à Kempis, and the translations of it corrected and amended. Printed at Oxford, 1639, by Leonard Lichfield, printer to the famous Universitie, for Edw. Forrest.

of this one small book of devotion, than by turning over many volumes of controversies. For I found in it great motives to self-denial, humility, obedience, and devotion; to humility in ourselves, to obedience towards superiors, to devotion towards God.

"Because the Authour thereof was too much addicted to one side, I made bold to leave out that which might offend any Christian palate, and have endeavoured that it should look with an equall and impartiall eye upon all good Christians. And it were to be wished that we had more bookes in this kind, and that we did especially apply ourselves to such kinde of books; for men now adaies are immoderately wedded to their own opinions, they labour to dispute well, not to live well, and delight more in books of controversy to strengthen them on that side they are, then in books of devotion to teach them what each good Christian should be."

The pious translator of 1677, who entitled it "The Christian's Pattern, or a Divine treatise of the Imitation of Christ," appears, from his Preface, to have entered truly into the spirit of à Kempis. I may mention his Frontispiece also, since some decry all such emblems as if they appealed too much to the senses. It is a burning heart, with wings, upon an Altar, with a Cross, (around which the serpent is entwined as dead), arising out of the heart; and above, the Pelican feeding its young ones with its own Blood, and rays of light shining down from the Name יהוה.

In 1714, it was paraphrased by Dean Stanhope. Even among the Presbyterians, Dr. Chalmers edited the three first books, omitting the fourth on the Holy Eucharist. I need not mention a later edition, by one rightly beloved. A few years ago, there was published a Companion[3] to the Christian's pattern, by Thos. à Kempis.

"This production," the translator says, "is distinct from the well-known 'Imitation of Christ,' and may be considered as a supplement to it, containing, in a small compass, the most excellent passages which are to be found in the other works of Thos. à Kempis."

I do not mean by produc-

[3] Translated from the German of Tersteegen by Samuel Jackson, Esq., 1831.

ing this list, to say that these Editors proceeded in the same way as myself, or to justify the details of any thing which I have done. I only mean, that the principle of "adapting" books from other portions of the Christian Church, has been, ever since the Reformation, recognised and acted upon in the English Church; that it has not been thought a privilege of the English Church to be "totus teres atque rotundus" in itself, and to have no need of the other portions of the body of Christ; or that whereas, through other portions of the Western Church, whatsoever God gives in one portion, belongs to all the rest, we alone were complete in ourselves, and could not profit by any practical experience, or knowledge of God's word, or fruits of meditation, or fervour of piety, which God, Who "distributeth to every one severally as He wills," may have taught to hearts, which, out of the compass of these isles, He drew to Himself, and had bound them to Him by the everlasting bonds of His love.

In explanation of what I intended, (however I may have failed in executing what I hoped,) I may extract some parts of what I said in the first of the books which I have thus edited, and in the last.

"The [4] object of the following little work, and of any others of the like sort which it may be permitted to the Editor to publish, is to meet, as far as may be, some of the wants which the mighty stirring of minds within our Church for some time past, has created. Such stirrings always leave something to be supplied. God mostly sets the heart in motion, makes her feel her want of somewhat out of herself and beyond all created beings, her need of Himself, Who alone can fill her; but how to attain to Him, He leaves most often to the guidance of others. Having brought Her to the Holy City, He withdraws His star for a time, and leaves it to the Church to point her to Bethlehem; although He will ever accompany her on the way, and His light will in the end stream on the place where she shall find Whom she seeks, the Living Bread, Who came down from heaven, and she shall know the Object of her search, as well by hidden and heavenly tokens made known to herself

[4] Avrillon, Guide to Lent, Preface, p. v. vi.

alone, as by the teaching of the Church out of the Holy Scriptures.

"In the present time there is a craving after a higher life; stricter and more abiding penitence; deeper and fuller devotion; mental prayer; meditation upon God and His Holy Mysteries; more inward love to Him; oneness of will with Him in all things; more habitual recollection in Him amid the duties of daily life; entire consecration to God; deadness to self and to the world; growth in the several Christian graces in detail; self-knowledge in order to victory over self; daily strife; stricter conformity with our Lord's blessed Commandments and all-holy Life, sympathy with His Passion, 'the fellowship of His Sufferings,' oneness with Him. Yet in all, people feel that they lack instruction; they see dimly what God would have of them,—they see not how to set about it.

"The [5] Editor, then, wished to minister through others what he was not qualified to provide himself. Directions as to holy seasons, contemplation of our Lord, guidance in the habits of meditation and mental prayer, to self-knowledge, to penitence, the spiritual life, the bearing of His Cross and conformity to Him, holy performance of the ordinary actions of daily life, Divine love, enlarged and deeper views of the Christian graces, were objects on which he wished to furnish such assistance as he might, for those who hunger after it.

"For both the large heads, under which these and the like wants would fall,—contemplation and self-discipline,—the spiritual writers of foreign Churches have, as yet, some obvious advantages over our own;—for the discipline and knowledge of self, through that knowledge of the human heart which results from habitual confession; for contemplation, in the Monastic Orders, as joining, in all cases, contemplation and mental prayer with charity and mortification.

"It must [6] be owned also, that our writers have, for some time at least, or for the most part, drawn too much from their own resources. The richest and most thoughtful of our writers, such as Hooker, and Andrewes, and Bishop

[5] Avrillon, Guide to Lent, Preface, p. x. xi. [6] Ib. p. xiii.—xv.

Taylor, are precisely those who have most largely converted into the substance of their own minds the thoughts of the saints and doctors who have been before. They have not only produced, but re-produced; like the scribe instructed to the kingdom of heaven, bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old. Yet, in the main, and of late certainly, we seem to have been cut off from intercourse with those before, as well as around us. We have been severed from the ancient hills on which the Sun of Righteousness aforetime rested, and which He illumined, as well as from the plain country round about us.

"Yet it was never meant that any portion of the Christian Church should be thus insulated. What is given by His good Spirit, at least what He has preserved, is not for one set of men or one nation only. Whatever He has preserved, He has preserved for our use; whatever He has any where given to the Church, He has given to the whole Church. It belongs to us, as a portion of that Church. It were an unthankful neglect of His gift, thus to think ourselves self-sufficing, as though each national Church were to be limited to the produce of its own soil,—to exist for itself, as if 'the Word of God came out from it, or came to it only.'

"It has not been wholly so, even in far less hopeful days. Thomas à Kempis was received among us, and made our own, and formed us to follow his and our Master; Pascal's well of deep thoughts has flowed among us without suspicion; S. Francis de Sales has taught many of us, 'the Love of God;' Nicole has preached to us through the lips of those least likely to adopt his words; and even in those sad times, when, as has been said, the angel of our Church seemed to hover at the very outskirts of our land, as ready to depart, the Apostolic Bishop Wilson counted the devout author of 'The Spiritual Combat' as one of ourselves[7].

"Still it may be well, at

[7] The learned and pious Bp. Taylor, the worthy and ingenious author of the 'Unbloody Sacrifice;' the devout author of the 'Spiritual Combat,' &c., have recommended some such help as this for the use and comfort of those devout souls who are deprived of this holy Sacrament in the Church. And to those we are in-

the very outset, in few words to meet what may be felt as a conscientious difficulty by some, who may dread lest the adaptation of books of another Communion create an undue sympathy with portions of doctrine foreign to our Church, or with that Communion itself.

"With regard to doctrine, there was little in the present work which created any difficulty. A very few sentences only (as far as the Editor recollects) have been omitted or modified. And generally, in books of the Continental Churches there are two distinct classes; some having so little of what is foreign or would be painful to us, that one should hardly be aware that they were not written for our own people; others, in which what is distressing or would be strange to us meets us every where. Yet to mention, once for all, the plan pursued as to these works, the Editor could not think it consistent with the commission he had received as a Pastor in this portion of the Lord's flock, to lay aside the office of guidance with which, however unworthy, he was, by the condescension of God, invested. He could not, as far as in him lay, turn any of the little ones in the Church adrift into a large pasture to discriminate for themselves. He has thought it his duty to omit, not only what he could not himself receive, but even some things which he could, which yet, he thought, would have been most naturally, from whatever cause, in us or in them, misconstrued.

"The Editor[8] felt no scruple then, in considering the state of our Church alone, in any adaptations which Christian wisdom or tenderness seemed to require. The works thus adapted, cannot, it must be thought, promote sympathy with doctrines which do not occur in them.

"With regard to the other possible objection, an *undue* sympathy with the Churches from whom we are separated, any such sympathy as would lead persons to forget their duties to the Church wherein God in His mercy has placed them, and undervalue His exceeding mercies to them in her and

debted for this intimation."—*Short and Easy Introduction to the Lord's Supper, fin.*

[8] Avrillon, Guide to Lent, Preface, p. xvii. xviii.

through her, would indeed be very miserable. Yet such an abuse is to be corrected by other means, not by mere ignorance of God's gifts to other branches of the Church, or by the refusal to profit by those gifts when fitted to ourselves. On the contrary, since an especial grace is promised to the lowly, and love is the first-fruit of the Spirit, it must even be a benefit, if, as time goes on, any such publications should contribute to a kindlier feeling towards those Churches through whose members we have been benefited, or a more instructed estimate both of ourselves and of them. An increasing tone of humility is one of the most hopeful signs in God's dealings with our Church. So may one hope, that as we humble ourselves, He will exalt her to the office which, in the course of His Providence, He seems to have marked out for her. In the mean time, whatever really tends to the holiness of her children, tends, in that same proportion, to the real benefit of the Church."

I may add extracts from the Preface of the last of these works, which I edited three years and a half ago :—

"Three[1] eventful years have now passed by, since the Editor began adapting this little series of devotional works. He had a twofold object in it: first, to supply with the sort of food their souls desired, a class of minds who could not but be the objects of the deeper sympathy, because, from the circumstances of our times, they often know not where to find it; and secondly, to supply it to them in such form as he conceived the Church of England, in which God had vouchsafed to call him to minister to souls, would give it to them. In a word, he wished both to supply wants which he knew to exist, and to save persons from the temptation of seeking out of the Church where God had placed them, what might be supplied to them within her. And he hoped that the very fact of 'adapting' these books 'to the use of the English Church,' would carry with it its own evidence that he did not wish to recommend to her children any thing but what, according to the

[1] Paradise of the Christian Soul, Advertisement, p. iii.—vi.

best of his judgment, was in accordance with her principles. His standard in so doing was not his own, but that which the Homilies of the Church of England so often inculcate, and her great Divines have followed, what 'was believed and taught by the old holy fathers and most ancient learned doctors, and received by the old Primitive Church, which was most uncorrupt and pure[2].' This the Church of England, who so often appeals to it in connexion with the Word of God, certainly did not believe to be any vague or uncertain rule. Nor, spurious passages apart, is it. Here, after the Word of God, and as its soundest expositors, has been, for these many years, his chief delight and study. Directed to Christian Antiquity by the Church in which he was admitted to minister, in her was his soul fed as in a large pasture, in her was at rest. To her, as having the pure tradition of Apostolic teaching, and, in her consentient witness, Apostolic authority, he yielded his full faith. In her he was as in his home. Her's was to him his native language. In her he sought all he wished to know, and in her found it. Her thoughts, her exposition of Holy Scripture, her faith, are his. Nothing jarred there. What she said, he wished in his measure to say; what she rejected, he rejected; where she was doubtful, he was content to be doubtful with her; what she knew not as part of the faith, he could not receive as his; where she was silent, he had no wish to pry. And when these troubled times came; in her, in another way, was his rest. Taught, himself, by the Church of England, and by her directed to Christian Antiquity, and finding in her what he had been taught, (only, it is no disparagement to say, more deeply than has been common among us,) he could not think that they whom the Church acknowledged as fathers, would disown as children, those who so revered them. However for our common sins, the Church may now be distracted, he felt that there was a real oneness of faith and Christian principle between us and those of old, as with those of other

[2] Homilies, B. ii. Serm, ii. 1, init.

Churches now also, in all things which have been matters of faith from the first. 'The hearts of the children were turned to the fathers,' why not 'the hearts of the fathers to the children?' Why should we think that they whom we own as 'fathers,' would not, if now in the flesh, and, if possible, more in their abode of love, own us as children?

"Neither then did it seem any presumptuous task, as a *private* minister, to 'adapt,' to the use of the children of the English Church, *private* books of edification, on the same principles, and in the same way, as the Church of England had the *public* offices. Towards the English Church it did not seem undutiful to think that she was not so independent of all GOD's gifts in all other portions of the Church, that nothing might be thence transferred with advantage to her. Members of her evidently thought otherwise, since they borrowed for her, and are largely borrowing for her, from much more questionable sources, where the Sacraments are denied, and rationalism more or less gleams through.

"Again, some writers, as Pascal, Nicole, S. Francis de Sales, S. Charles Borromeo, à Kempis, (not to speak of Fénélon, Massillon, and others,) have been as household names among us. The 'Imitation' has been studied by devout minds, unconscious that they were not studying the produce of our own Communion.

"Yet neither did it seem wrong to the Editor, to 'adapt,' according to a definite rule, books which had more of modern doctrine in them. For as to the authors themselves, surely we must think that in Paradise they must be glad that their writings, under any condition, short of denial of the truth, should do good to souls for whom, with them, CHRIST died. They know not, in their rest and love there, the distractions and hard judgments in the Church here below. Nor, if they here lived in a system, partly unsanctioned by Holy Scripture and by the Primitive Church, need we think that, holy as they were, the Sight of GOD has not purged away some errors which clave to them here. Nor need it, surely, seem either presumptuous or arbitrary, to attempt to separate, by a defi-

nite standard, that which is ancient from that which is modern; and since in all portions of the Church, (with the exception of some few great minds, as St. Bernard,) most has been learned from our common 'fathers,' to retain what S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, or S. Ambrose say, or what has the sanction of the whole undivided Church, and to omit what belongs to a more recent teaching.

"This 'definite standard' was, to the Editor, Catholic Antiquity, regard being also had to the tone of mind of the Church in which, by the mercy of GOD, he has been admitted to minister.

"Such instances[3] may, perhaps, suffice to assure any who may be anxious as to such an one as the Editor, that he has had no thought of supplying, by instalments, as it were, a teaching beyond that of the Church, in which he has, by the undeserved goodness of Almighty GOD, been admitted to minister. Nor did he even wish to introduce, by his private act, whatever might, here and there, be found in Christian Antiquity, in the ages which the English Church had adopted as her pattern and guide. What were matters of faith then, can alone be matters of faith now; what were 'pious opinions' then, have surely not ceased to be such now. One object alone he had before him, to furnish to minds who were yearning after deeper devotions, practical guidance, a more spiritual and inward life, aids in passing holy seasons aright, knowledge of themselves, modes of meditating on the Mysteries of the Faith and on their Redeemer's love, books which might help them, by the grace of GOD, whereby they might grow to His praise and glory, in the courts of the house of their GOD, where He had planted them. All the errors in this, as in all besides, may He forgive, Whom herein I wished to serve, expecting the dispraise of man, and seeking only the good of those for whom He shed His Blood!"

[3] Paradise of the Christian Soul, Advertisement, p. xi. xii.

V. "By encouraging the use of rosaries and crucifixes."

I very much regret that this statement was made without explanation, because the idea which persons ordinarily attach to "rosaries" is, probably, mumbling over carelessly certain formal prayers, without much minding how they are said, so that a certain number are said; and "crucifixes" are thought of only as objects of worship. Tyndall complains of those who "*patter* [*i.e.* say Pater Nosters] all day with lips only, that which the heart understandeth not." "How blinde are they which think prayers to be the pattering of many wordes." Beads and rosaries are also in their minds connected with devotions to the Blessed Virgin; as Fox speaks of "the [4] rosarie of our Ladie's Psalter," in which also the devotions to the Blessed Virgin predominated over those to God, as we hear of "150 [5] Ave-Marias and 15 Paters;" and Shakespeare so speaks, "to number Ave-Maries on his beades [6]."

I need not say to your Lordship, that the devotions which I recommended were nothing of this sort, and that such devotions were excluded. My object in the devotions which I edited in the Paradise, was wholly of a different kind. Every one who has experienced great weakness, (such as illness, or long fever, or sleeplessness will produce,) or when suffering under distractions, or in walking, will know how much easier it is to say the same prayers over again and again, than different

[4] Fox, Acts, p. 667.

[5] Brevint, Saul and Samuel, c. 8.

[6] Mr. Dodsworth, of course, did not intend to convey any impression of this sort. He doubtless, simply meant the devotions in the Paradise, and forgot that his words, unexplained, might, even naturally, be understood of the devotions which usually, although not always, form part of the Rosary in the Roman Church. Those in the "Rosarium, SS. Trinitatis a præclaris Theologis usitatum et commendatum," in the Paradisus P. 1, are exclusively addressed to the Holy Trinity.

prayers. The fewer words or thoughts, the better suited for those in weakness or suffering. Even a complex thought, or two thoughts occurring in the same sentence, or two images of God's nearness in trouble (as in Is. xliii. 2), are too much at once for a weakened brain. It is a rule as to those in sickness, that prayers should contain as much as possible in as few words as possible. The Name of JESUS itself, often repeated, is a volume of prayer. But it is a relief also to the mind to have some measure of its devotion. Most use this in health. They pray, as it may be, in the morning for half an hour, or for some definite time, longer or shorter. They do not leave this to chance or to the devotion of the moment. If they do, they mostly pray less. They have, more or less, a rule for their devotion. This was, I suppose, the origin of the repetition of the Lord's Prayer. It was the poor man's only prayer. And so he said it again and again, and those who have said it earnestly again and again, have found that they said it most deeply, and from their inmost souls, the last time that they said it. Would that all our peasantry said the Lord's Prayer many times in the day! There would be much less of sin, and much more of devotion to God and their Saviour. "We instruct," say our ecclesiastical laws under King Canute, "that[7] every Christian man learn so that he may at least be able to understand aright orthodox faith, and to learn the Pater-noster and Creed: because with the one, every Christian man shall pray to God, and with the other, manifest orthodox faith. Christ Himself first sang Pater-noster, and taught that prayer to His disciples. And in that Divine prayer there are seven prayers. Therewith, who inwardly sings it, he ever sends to God Himself *a message regarding every need a man may have*, either for this life, or for that to come. But how, then, can any man ever inwardly pray to God, unless he have inward true love for, and right belief in, God?" The Lord's Prayer is the Prayer Book of those who cannot read or remember prayers which man has written. It contains, as the

[7] In Thorpe's Ancient Laws, i. p. 373,

Bishops under King Canute so beautifully said, "a message to God regarding every need a man may have, either for this life or for that to come." It may be made to bear on the Mysteries of the Passion, by being said in thought of them, and praying by virtue of them. It may be a prayer for Holy Communion, or for our daily food; for personal conformity to the will of God, in every accident of life, or for grace and strength to perform it; for deliverance from temptation, or for perseverance to the end, and final deliverance from evil and the Evil one; for the well-being of the Church, or for the conversion of the Heathen. The different paraphrases of it, such as Bishop Wilson's or St. Augustine's, draw only single draughts of living water out of its deep well. Whatever longing be in the mind, all the words accord with it, and express it more deeply than any other.

This main, earnest, longing of the heart becomes, as it were, the key note to the whole prayer. As is the key note, so will be the whole harmony. The melody made to God will be the same; but it may be joyous or plaintive, or flow forth stilly and equably. It may run through the whole compass of human feeling. The petitions for the hallowing of God's Name, the Coming of His kingdom, the doing of His will, supply of our needs, forgiveness for failures, strength proportioned to our trial, deliverance from evil in every circumstance of man's long shifting being, express the one universal cry of the rational creature to the Creator, of the redeemed to the Redeemer. He Who prepares the heart, and His ear hearkeneth thereto, Who knoweth our needs before we ask Him, Whose Ear is to our secret heart more than to our voice, will well discern the meaning of our longings, as they ascend to Him in that His Divine prayer. He Who heareth the raven's one cry for all its wants, will not fail to understand the heart's voice, if it ask that what it longs for should be according to His Will.

In all and each, the soul speaks to the Father in the Son's own words; and how, says St. Cyprian, should it be sooner heard?

There is nothing more mechanical in saying the

Lord's Prayer seven times consecutively, than in saying it seven times in the course of the public Service. They who have said it most devotionally would most miss it, the seventh or the eighth time. The mental application of the Lord's Prayer may be as varied as our wants. Our Lord Himself taught us, by His own Example, in that most bitter hour of His Agony for us, that, in trouble which overwhelms the soul, we need not look about for many words in which to tell our Heavenly Father our sufferings and our needs. "He left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words."

Or if, again, one may on such a subject refer to the simplicity of childhood, since our Lord sets it forth to us as a pattern, they, when they would plead most earnestly with their parents, repeat the same words. It is not then, at least, artificial to do so. We have all felt how touching, or how hard to refuse, the simple earnestness was, which used no argument, save that of love, and the anxious repetition of its wish in the same simple words.

Again, human poetry, it may well be supposed, appeals to fixed principles of human feelings, which it calls out. Yet in every sort of human poetry, which aims at encouraging, rousing, kindling man's energy, or which appeals to his tenderer feelings, war-songs, boat-songs, ballads, political (such as the Jacobite) songs, (I need not mention more), no more forcible way, is found, than to repeat as the "burden" of the song some few simple, pathetic, or energetic words. Yet this very poetry (it is the more to be observed) is intended to act mainly upon minds of the very same class, the simple and uninstructed. Some of us may still recollect the effect of some such tender cadence on our boyish or youthful hearts.

Again, how, in the Psalms, which have always been so large a part of the prayers of the Church, is the same thought expressed, according to the very structure of the verse, in the two divisions of it, on the very ground that the petition becomes more earnest by being repeated. It is the very structure of devotion, as used by sacred poets, speaking "as they were

moved by the Holy Ghost." It is used alike in joy and in sorrow, in penitence and thanksgiving, in earnest appeals to God, or in overflowing gladness. It is this very principle, which gives the deep pathos to the structure of the Psalms. At times, the words are the very same; more commonly the thought is varied slightly in words, so as to give variety to the mind, yet the substance of the thought is the same.

And this, we may observe, is especially the character of the very deepest Psalms, if one may so speak, Psalms which touch or stir the very deepest depths of our hearts. Such are, *e. g.* the penitential Psalms; the rhythm of which is often, in this very respect, much more striking in the Hebrew:—

> "Do not in Thine anger rebuke me,
> And not in Thy wrath chasten me;
> Have mercy upon me, O Lord, for weak am I;
> Heal me, O Lord, for troubled are my bones."

Or in Psalm xxxviii.:—

> "For Thine arrows sink down in me,
> And thine Hand sinketh down upon me.
> No health in my flesh from the presence of Thy wrath;
> No soundness in my bones from the presence of my sin.
> For my wickednesses are gone over my head
> Like a heavy burden, they are too heavy for me."

It would be to transcribe the Psalter to give instances[8]. So extensive is this principle of what is called "Hebrew parallelism," that critics who allow themselves liberties as to the sacred text, have not unfrequently proposed to alter it, when the two members of the sentence do not seem to express the same thought, but would, if some word were slightly altered. But perhaps, it might be true to say, that this repetition of the thought is most close when the deepest feelings are uttered, whether of sorrow, suffering, or of peace. It occurs alike in Ps. vi. xxii. xxiii. xxv. lxxxviii. lxxxxix. xcii. xcvi., in the deep penitence of Ps. li., the trusting overwhelmed sorrow of Ps. cii.,

[8] Lowth gives instances under the head "Synonymous Parallelism." Prelim. Diss. to Isaiah, p. xv. sqq.

or the exulting joyousness of Ps. ciii., or Ps. cxlvii. —cl.

But, besides this general law, verses or parts of verses are directly repeated in the Psalms and in Isaiah[9], as the expression of a continued abiding feeling, and a means of promoting it in those who use them. No one can have read Ps. xlii. 5. 11, and xliii. 5, without feeling how much is added by the three-fold repetition of the self-expostulation and firm resolve, "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise Him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God." And this because it is expressive of a truth, that the soul after having been lifted up to God, still sinks down again through its natural heaviness. Twice the Psalmist lifts it up out of oppressive heaviness; the third time amid rising hope. The tenderness of the Psalms, whereby God teaches us amid heavy disquiet to turn to Him, would have been much diminished had not the same tender words been thrice repeated.

So, again, in that affecting prayer for the Church, the Vine which God had planted and nourished, and then allowed to be wasted, all will have felt the threefold appeal to God, "Turn us again, O Lord God of Hosts, show the light of Thy Countenance, and we shall be whole," which is varied only in the titles given to God, expressive of increasing hope, "O God," "O God of Hosts," "O Lord God of Hosts[1]." Yet the like repetition of joyous words, equally give vent to exulting joy, as in Ps. lxvii. 3. 5, "Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee;" and in the twofold, "The Lord of Hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge[2]."

Who has not felt, at least on the morning of the Ascension, that triumphant burst?—

> "Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
> And be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors:
> And the King of Glory shall come in.

[9] c. ix. 12. 17. 21. x. 4. "For all this His anger is not turned away, but His Hand is stretched out still."

[1] Ps. lxxx. 3. 7. 19.

[2] Ps. xlvi. 7. 11.

Who is the King of Glory?
It is the Lord strong and mighty,
Even the Lord mighty in battle."

And then, who has not followed upwards that repetition, as though he heard the echo of that first marvelling question and response, sounding from Heaven to Heaven, as our Lord ascended in our Human Nature amid the admiration and awe of the Heavenly Hosts, to the Right Hand of the Father, until the wondrous tale of the condescension of our God had encircled the whole compass of spiritual being, now made one in Him?—

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
And be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors:
And the King of Glory shall come in.
Who is the King of Glory?
Even the Lord of Hosts.
He is the King of Glory."

Again, another Ascension Psalm is surely the more triumphant, because it begins and ends with the same words of praise, "O Lord[3] our Governor, how excellent is Thy name in all the world!" And an Easter Psalm (so much does this repetition occur in joyous Psalms) closes the two halves of prayer and of deliverance with the same verse: "Set[4] up Thyself, O God, above the heavens, and thy glory above all the earth." In other cases[5] the two verses correspond with one another; but there is some slight variation in the words, without impairing the effect of the whole.

The most systematic Psalm, however, of this sort, is Psalm cxxxvi.; but still not as an insulated case. It contains the very words of Ps. cxxxv. 4. 10—12, but separates them by its own peculiar "burden," "for His

[3] Ps. viii. 1. 9.

[4] Ps. lvii. 6. 12.

[5] Ps. xlix. 12. 20 (where the variation is but of a single letter, יבין ילין) and Ps. xcix. 5. 9, where the first and last clause is the same with a remarkable cadence, in the Hebrew. Again, in Ps. cxiv. 5, 6, the Apostrophe to the sea, the Jordan, the mountains, the hills, is much more emphatic, because exactly the same words are used as in ver. 3, 4.

mercy endureth for ever." And none, probably, have heard that twenty-sevenfold hymn of praise, "for His mercy endureth for ever," brought out by music (with which the Psalms were sung in the temple-service), without feeling the force of a few simple words, repeating again and again, unvaryingly, the unvarying love of God. And these very words, which form its burden, "for His mercy endureth for ever," must have entered very deeply into all Hebrew Psalmody. They are the characteristic of the temple music which David appointed. They form the close of the Psalm delivered by David when he brought back the ark; he chose the singers to "give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good; for His mercy endureth for ever[6]." When Solomon brought up the ark, it was "when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For He is good; for His mercy endureth for ever: that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord[7]." It again was the praise when the fire came down to consume the burnt-offering; "they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord, saying; For He is good: for His mercy endureth for ever[8]." Jehoshaphat, going out to battle with the great multitude of the Ammonites, "appointed singers unto the Lord, and that should praise the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army, and to say, Praise the Lord; for His mercy endureth for ever[9]." After the restoration from the captivity, "they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord; because He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever toward Israel[1]."

All must have observed, how the Psalter, which began with the calm declaration of the blessedness of the man, who keepeth from evil and delighteth in the law of God, becomes more joyous at its close[2], until the last Psalm but one, be-

[6] 1 Chron. xvi. 34.
[7] 1 Chron. xvi. 41. 2 Chron. vii. 6; v. 13.
[8] 2 Chron. vii. 3.
[9] 2 Chron. xx. 21.
[1] Ezra iii. 11.
[2] Ps. cxlv.—cl.

gins with the sevenfold [3], "Praise ye the Lord, Praise Him;" and the last with its twelvefold, "Praise ye the Lord, Praise Him," sounds like the endless song of the blessed, and our earthly Psalter dies away in the sound, "Let all spirit praise the Lord;" not flesh any longer, but "spirit," when we shall be made like unto His Glorious Body, and all shall be spiritual and filled with the fulness of God. But again, that twelvefold "Praise ye the Lord" must have dwelt on many hearts, who unknowingly speak against the repetition of the same words.

This has been carried yet further by sacred music. It is the very basis of our anthems, and what are technically called "services;" yet these have *their* basis in a law of nature. Few, however little they may understand of music (as myself), can have heard Handel's anthem, dwelling tenderly on the few simple words, "Lord, we trust alone in Thee," or that which closes with "God shall give his people the blessing of peace," or that, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant O Lord, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified," or, in a different style, the thrilling anthem which closes with "The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil, that is understanding;" or, again, that swelling burst of praise, "We thank Thee, we thank Thee, we thank Thee, and bless Thy Glorious Name;" —none can, I think, have listened to them without feeling how touching, or soothing, or devotional, or penetrating an effect the varied repetition, again and again, of the same words of Holy Scripture may have. The memory of the cadence, as of a soul passing into everlasting peace, "peace, peace," dwells in the mind whenever the words occur; and the words, "In Thee Alone," "We trust *Alone* in Thee," furnish one deep varied rest and repose in God Himself, in God Alone. Thus, from the simple utterance of childhood to the deepest knowledge of the mystery of sound, whereby it moves the inmost soul, there is one principle of the power excited over the mind by the earnest repetition of the same simple words.

For the sake of illustra-

[3] See Bible Version.

tion, I will set down the words as they are actually sung. It is the character of the music of all the cathedral or mother churches in our Church. If it did not have an effect in raising the soul to God, elaborate music in God's house would be profane. Yet this has been the fruit of the study of devout minds; and it has a powerful effect upon devout minds. No idea of the effect of varied voices, of the rising and falling of the sounds, the fulness of a chorus, or the tenderness of a single voice, can of course be given, except by the ear itself. I would here only set before the mind, the repetition of the same devotional words as an acknowledged principle in our Church. Some might be able to conceive the deep pathos.

"O Lord, we trust alone in Thee, alone in Thee, alone, alone in Thee we trust, in Thee O Lord, in Thee O Lord, O Lord we trust in Thee alone."

This is so sung by one voice, and then repeated with full chorus.

"Enter not into judgment with Thy servant O Lord, for in Thy sight, for in Thy sight, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified, for in Thy sight, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified." (Three times.)

Chorus:

"Now[4] therefore, our God, we thank Thee, we thank Thee, we thank Thee, O God; we thank Thee and praise Thy glorious Name, we thank Thee and praise Thy Name, and praise Thy Name, and praise Thy Name, we thank Thee, we thank Thee and praise Thy glorious Name, we thank Thee, we thank Thee, we thank Thee and praise Thy glorious Name, Thy glorious Name, we thank Thee, we thank Thee O God, we thank Thee, we thank Thee O God, and praise Thy glorious Name."

"I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever, for ever, for ever, for ever, for ever and ever, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever, for ever and ever, for ever and ever, for ever and ever, for ever and ever, and I will dwell in the house for ever, for ever, for ever and ever, for ever, for ever and ever."

"The Lord shall give strength unto His people, the Lord shall give strength unto His people: the Lord shall give His people the blessing of peace, peace. (Five Hallelujahs in Chorus.) The Lord shall give His people the blessing of peace, peace, peace, the Lord shall give His people the blessing of peace, peace, peace, the blessing of peace."

"O put your trust in God, O put your trust in God, O put

[4] This is copied from the anthem, as written; as sung, the words "we thank Thee" are repeated yet more frequently.

your trust in God alway, alway, ye people; pour out your hearts before Him, pour out your hearts before Him, pour out your hearts before Him, for God is our hope, God is our hope, God is our hope, is our hope." (Twenty-eight Hallelujahs.)

The same law reappears in the simplest tunes of our village Psalmody, in which the last line or couplet is repeated, on no other principle than that the mind dwells with pleasure on the last line of the praise of God. It is a sort of echo, which the soul does not willingly part with. And I have thought that I have observed, even in the most untaught village choirs, that there was perhaps especial feeling expressed in these sounds of praise, thus taken up, and anew repeated to God.

But it may be said that this is artificial, and that prayer to God should be wholly natural. This is an abuse of the word "artificial." For what proceeds upon certain known laws of nature, or is regulated by certain principles, is not therefore, in a bad sense, artificial. The intricate rules of Greek metre are, in one sense, artificial. They are, unless analysed, perceived, in fact, only in that when broken, the harmony is less perfect. The war-song of Tyrtæus was not less, it was more, effective, because in an artificial measure. The word of God has distinct rules of its own. What could seem more artificial than an alphabetic Psalm, *i. e.* a Psalm in which the successive verses began with the successive letters of the alphabet? What could seem more artificial, if we were not accustomed to it in God's word, than a Psalm, divided into portions, all the verses in each of which portions should begin with the same letter, and in which (as a rule) the word "Thy" should occur in almost every verse, and there should in every verse be some word to designate the law, will, revelation of Almighty God? It might serve to illustrate this artificialness, that, under one letter, there is a sort of stanza, distinct in itself in a manner, yet in which each of the eight verses, (the first also,) of necessity begins with the word "and," because two other words only begin with the letter required[5]. These would seem "very artificial," hard

[5] Of the other stanzas of eight verses in Ps. cxix., in two, seven verses begin with the same preposition; in a third, six; in a fourth,

laws under which a Psalm was to be formed. In any other book but Holy Scripture, people would say "What a stiff, capricious law this! how unnatural to tie down the mind to begin with a certain letter! how can the soul pour itself out freely under such restrictions as these?" And yet, under such restrictions, have been written some of the tenderest, deepest words of mourning, of instruction, of praise.

If any were bid to select a book of tender sympathy, uttering the deepest feeling of sacred sorrow, he could not but select the Lamentations of Jeremiah. It is the voice of God Himself teaching us how to grieve. Yet its four first chapters are alphabetic, and that in such order, that in the three first chapters under each letter, there are three sentences, and in the third chapter each of the three sentences begins with the same letter. The three first verses are arranged under *a*; the three next under *b*; and so on. This rule as to the letters few translators have been able to retain; but the peculiar rhythm of the triplets, unusual in Hebrew, has aided, no doubt, by its equable, gentle flow, the plaintiveness of the words [6].

Besides the Lamentations and the last chapter of Proverbs, there are seven Psalms formed after this method; but so little has it produced any stiffness, that (with the exception of the cxixth, which is known to have been so written) an English reader would not recognize which they are. They are, indeed, rather remarkable, for their gentle, easy flow, and for the simple energy of their words, on the very ground that each verse, though connected with the preceding, forms a whole in itself. And yet Psalms xxv. xxxiv. and xxxvii. (which are of this sort) do form wonderful wholes; Ps. xxv., God's

the initial letter is furnished in seven cases by the use of a conjugation which begins with it; in a fifth, six times by the use of the feminine future; in a sixth, five times by the masculine future; in a seventh the same word is repeated five times; and four times in an eighth; and the same root four times in a ninth. Yet under such laws was that Psalm written, of such wonderful depth, and its several parts so marvellously knit together.

[6] This is noticed by Bishop Lowth, de Poesi Hebr. Præl. 22.

leading on through chastisements, and Ps. xxxiv. and xxxvii., His unfailing mercies towards those who trust in Him, and the punishment of the wicked. Ps. cxi. and cxii. again, are wonderful counterparts of God's mercy *to* man, and His grace *in* him. Ps. cxlv. might almost be singled out, as one beautiful simple strain of praise. And what could any say of the cxixth Psalm? The whole Church of Christ gives answer, which has prayed, commented, meditated on this Psalm, more perhaps than on any other. St. Ambrose[7] speaks of it as the "sun with its full light glowing with the meridian heat;" and St. Hilary as "containing all the precepts of living, believing, pleasing God," "the perfection of teaching and our instruction;" and Theodoret, that "this Psalm sufficeth to perfect in virtue those who long for perfect virtue, and to rouse to zeal those who were living in sloth, to refresh the dispirited and set in order the relaxed, and, in a word, to apply an all-containing medicine to the varied diseases of men." St. Augustine delayed to comment on it, until he had finished the whole Psalter, and then yielded only to the "long and vehement urgency" of his friends, "because," he says, "as often soever as I essayed to think thereon, it always exceeded the powers of my intent thought."

But, apart from its deeper depths, none can have used that Psalm, with the thought of speaking in every verse after the three first, face to face to God, and not have felt how wondrous a Psalm it is.

Again, it may not be artificial, that in Psalm lxii., out of twelve verses, eight begin with the same letter, and two more with a similar sound; but it is remarkable that half the verses begin with the same word, signifying "only," "nothing but."[8] It would be thought artificial to lay down such a law for composition, that six verses should begin with the word "only." And yet this Psalm might be singled out by an English reader, as one of simple trust in God.

[7] The following are from the Prefaces to the several Comments.

[8] Ver. 1, Only unto God; 2, Only He; 4, Only—they counsel; 5, Only to God; 6, Only He; 9, Only vanity.

Yet the emphasis deepens through this repetition. One trust only has the righteous, in God; one aim only, the wicked, to overthrow him; one only result there is, the wicked are only vanity.

A mechanical structure, then, is no chain to those who understand it. As well might one think that the measured tread of the soldier was an hindrance to his march; that all the laws of melody were a restraint to the soul of music; that irregularity was the only rule; whereas most probably all which is according to the law of God, does move, in the order of His Providence or His Grace, according to fixed rules, and that only is irregular which is unruled and unattuned by His Spirit. All things are stiff to those unused to them. The rudiments of all things are slowly learnt. We learn but slowly to use what, when learnt, is used with almost lightning's speed. One, inexperienced, cannot understand how what he knows not should be so like nature to one well-practised. Music is to the unskilful like a miraculous unearthly gift. Mathematical combinations become almost intuitive. We recognize this mistake very readily in things which we ourselves know. We can see that objections to "forms of prayer" as formal, are like thinking that the body must hinder the operations of the embodied soul.

It has commonly been thought that one eminent object of this peculiarity in these Psalms was to fix them the more upon the memory. They are not easier to learn than other Psalms, except for the fewness of the words; nor would this apply to the Lamentations. But as far as their structure does aid the mind to recollect whether it have repeated all the verses, it is precisely the same sort of help as a rosary. Any how it is a witness that God, who disdains not to speak to man's heart after the manner of men, who used alike the simple beauty of history, or the glowing richness of Isaiah, or the tenderness of Jeremiah, to find access to the heart of man, did not disdain the use of this simple, and, as it seems, arbitrary mechanism, for the service of man. It is as condescending on the part of God to use the eloquence of the most fervid prophet as the mechanism of the acrostic.

There is yet another ground which may be mentioned. No one can observe the use of numbers in Holy Scripture, especially in the Old Testament; how the use of certain numbers pervades the Hebrew ritual, without being convinced that they have some special meaning. Not to enter further now into so large a subject (which I have naturally been called upon to study), the numbers 3 and 7, 10 and 12, are obviously, on the surface, symbolical in the Old Testament. All, I cannot doubt, have a mysterious meaning of their own. This is recognized alike by Jewish, Christian, Heathen Antiquity. In Heathenism, although corrupted by Pantheism, or idolatry of nature, it still, in its basis, expresses a principle of our nature, or is a relic of Paradise. It has not been enough observed how, in parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, especially the Psalter, the words in each half sentence are often gathered into certain numbers, especially that of three, which is, in a varied way, the symbol of the Holy Trinity.

This, however, which is facilitated by the structure of the sacred language, and is peculiar to it, was but a further expression of what lay upon the surface, and had been appointed by God himself. In the Old Testament, from its very object of inculcating the Unity of God, the doctrine of the Trinity was necessarily veiled. But God Himself, in that He directed that, day by day, the Priest should bless in His Name by a threefold repetition of It, and yet Himself calls it the placing of His own Name upon them[9], while He taught them His Unity, prepared them to believe in the Trinity. The words occupied the same place as, in the Christian Church, the express blessing in the Name of the Three Persons, in all our services[1]; it was a call-

[9] "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee;
The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee;
The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.
And they shall put My Name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them."—Numb. vi. 24—27.

[1] In the words of the New Testament, in the Daily and the Burial Service, in other forms in the Holy Communion and in

ing Their Name upon them, as upon us in Holy Baptism; it conveyed, day by day, Their blessing, in fact, though not in distinct words. As soon as the light of the Gospel is cast upon it, it shines back with the full effulgence of the Trinity. On the Jews, it impressed that there was some mystery in the Divine Nature, as they themselves have noted, by marking the Sacred Name, in this place, with three several accents. And this was, again, the source of a remarkable phenomenon in the Psalms, which carried on and impressed the mystery, which it attests the sacred writers to have been guided to feel. Themselves, blessed daily by the threefold repetition of that Name, they, on different occasions, express in the same threefold way their own debt to God, and praise Him. Blessed secretly by the Trinity, they secretly bless and praise, as they had been blessed.

This structure is the more remarkable in Hebrew, because it breaks the parallelism, above spoken of, which in different forms is so generally preserved. For since the Hebrew verse consists mostly of two divisions, the threefold praise of God occupies a verse and a half, and the remaining half verse stands by itself. In two of the Psalms this is twice repeated; and the repetition of so remarkable a structure makes it the more evident that it is not accidental. This will be shown by setting down instances:—

"1 Give[1] unto the Lord, O ye mighty,
Give unto the Lord glory and strength,
2 Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His Name;
Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.

4 The Voice of the Lord is powerful,
The Voice of the Lord is full of majesty,
5 The Voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars;
Yea, the Lord breaketh the cedars of Lebanon."

"1 Sing[2] unto the Lord a new song:
Sing unto the Lord, all the earth.

Confirmation, in the Marriage Service. In the Commination Service, perhaps, as taken out of the Law, nearly the Old Testament form is used; in the Visitation of the Sick, a blessing is prefixed, premising the doctrine of the Unity.

[1] Ps. xxix. 1, 2; 4, 5. [2] Ps. xcvi. 1, 2; 7, 8.

2 Sing unto the Lord, bless His Name:
Shew forth His salvation from day to day.

7 Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people,
Give unto the Lord glory and strength.
8 Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His Name;
Bring an offering, and come into His courts."

"9 O Israel[3], trust in the Lord:
He is their help and their shield.
10 O House of Aaron, trust in the Lord:
He is their help and their shield.
11 Ye that fear the Lord, trust in the Lord:
He is their help and their shield."

"15 The[4] voice of joy and health is in the dwellings of the righteous:
The right Hand of the Lord bringeth mighty things to pass.
16 The right Hand of the Lord hath the pre-eminence:
The right Hand of the Lord bringeth mighty things to pass."

It was a new revelation of that sacred Truth, when Isaiah heard the seraphic hymn, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth;" and earnest minds must have been led the rather to meditate on the mystery of the Priestly blessing upon earth, when they learnt that it was the echo of the song of the heavenly Hosts, that they in Heaven blessed God in the same form that we on earth are blessed by Him. It is shallow, as well as profane, when some moderns have attempted to remove this impressiveness, by adverting to Jeremiah's threefold call "Earth[5], Earth, Earth, hear the Word of the Lord," or "the[6] temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these;" or "I[7] will overturn, overturn, overturn." Rather, these, as being subsequent[8] to that vision, are doubtless in part formed

[3] Ps. cxv. 9—11.
[4] Ps. cxviii. 15, 16.
[5] Jer. xxii. 29.
[6] vii. 4.
[7] Ezek. xxi. 27.
[8] 2 Sam. xviii. 33 has also been referred to; but although the name of Absalom *is* repeated three times, that repetition is not distinct, not being uniform; the words "my son," which are united with it, being repeated before and after, and without order. Affecting in itself, it has not this sort of impressiveness which consists in the distinct threefold repetition; its being threefold is matter of observation, not at once impressed. "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!"

upon it. They do teach, though still veiled, how the Temple of God is the Temple of the Trinity; how, as the fulness of blessing is in the Presence of the Ever-blessed Trinity, so, utter destruction is in Their wrath.

This same structure occurs in two hymns in our Prayer Book, the Te Deum, and the "Glory be to God on High," in the Communion Service, which is, I believe, in substance, the earliest Christian hymn extant. The Te Deum, for the most part, remarkably falls into pairs. But after the song of the Cherubim and Seraphim, "Holy, Holy, Holy," itself, in form, a confession of the Trinity, there follow the threefold "Praise Thee:"—

> "The glorious company of the Apostles: praise Thee.
> The goodly fellowship of the Prophets: praise Thee.
> The noble army of Martyrs: praise Thee:"

which is the more remarkable, in that there follows the mention of the whole Church throughout the world; but the word is this time varied, as was the case in Ps. xxix. and xcvi. In the confession of the Trinity Itself—

> "The Father: of an infinite Majesty;
> Thine honourable, true: and Only Son;
> Also the Holy Ghost: the Comforter:"

this was so natural as not to strike us, save for the solemnity of the words, to which the cadence is subordinate. Still this form need not have been kept. But it is remarkable that these are the only exceptions to the sort of distich in which the Te Deum runs, unless our translators have purposely at the close placed the "O Lord" at the beginning of the verse, in order to close with a threefold prayer:—

> "O Lord, have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us;
> O Lord, let Thy mercy lighten upon us, as our trust is in Thee.
> O Lord, in Thee have I trusted; let me never be confounded."

In the Athanasian Creed, (formerly called the "Psalm Quicunque,") which has throughout a remarkable rhythm, it may be observed that the confession of the

Trinity is in a different way cast into this threefold form. It is said of the Three Persons that They are—1. Uncreate; 2. Incomprehensible; 3. Eternal; and then, inverting the order, it is denied that there are three Eternals, Incomprehensibles, Uncreated. Then again it resumes, that all Three are—1. Almighty; 2. God; 3. Lord; yet not Three Almighties, Gods, Lords, but One.

That silent confession of the Trinity in the Kyrie eleeson which we have retained,

> "Lord have mercy upon us!
> Christ have mercy upon us!
> Lord have mercy upon us!"

again ascends to very early ages of the Church. It too evidences how congenial it is to the heart of man to express its deepest wants in few, brief, unexplained words.

The threefold repetition in the "Gloria in excelsis" is the more remarkable, because it is addressed to our Lord alone, and so the use of the number, as in some places of Holy Scripture, is rather the habitual expression of the mind, than has any direct bearing upon doctrine. Yet in this short hymn there is the threefold "that takest away the sins of the world," and the threefold ascription "Thou only art:"—

> "—— that takest away the sins of the word: have mercy upon us.
> Thou that takest away the sins of the world: have mercy upon us.
> Thou that takest away the sins of the world: receive our prayer."

and—

> "For Thou only art Holy;
> Thou only art the Lord;
> Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art Most High, &c."

These hints may suffice, perhaps, to hinder some from thinking it at once unnatural, and strained, and formal, to use numbers in connexion with prayers.

The Lord's Prayer might be said devoutly three times together, in thought of the Holy Trinity; or seven times, in thought of the reconciliation of God to the world in Christ Jesus our Lord, and of our eternal rest in Him; or ten times, in thought of the consummation of all things, when all things now scattered shall be gathered into one in Him. And who can venture to say, that if any one were devoutly to say the Lord's Prayer five times, in thought of the Five Wounds which our Dear Lord received for us, that he might not cherish His Passion more fervently? Some who have done so have found it.

Such were the uses of the Rosary formerly. It was nothing more mechanical to say the Lord's Prayer thirty times, than to pray for thirty minutes. Practices which might seem distracting to those unacquainted with them, are natural with use. The saying of the Lord's Prayer has, before now, become to the poor man rather a measure of time, than is measured by time. In France and Spain, the peasant was wont, of old to describe the length of an action by the number of "Our Fathers" which would ordinarily be said in it. And this very fact is a witness that it was said with uniformity, and without distractions; since with distractions it would occupy unequal spaces of time.

It was on this same principle, of frequent devout repetition, that the devotions in "the Paradise for the Christian Soul," alluded to by Mr. Dodsworth, were formed. They are nothing more than devotions to the Holy Trinity, or hymns to our Lord Jesus Christ, or thanksgivings to Him for the Precious sheddings of His Blood.

In the first of these, the words repeated are, the verses, Rev. vii. 12; Isa. vi. 3; and the Gloria Patri. I will set down the words, my Lord. They are,—1. "Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever;" 2. "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God of Sabaoth; the whole earth is full of His glory;" and 3. "Glory be to the Father," &c.

Again, in the second, the devotions with which the stanzas are interspersed are the Creed, the Lord's Pray-

er, and the prayer from the Visitation of the Sick, "O Saviour of the world, Who by Thy Cross and Precious Blood hast redeemed us, save us and help us, we humbly beseech Thee, O Lord."

Yet each stanza is a prayer to our Lord, recalling to our mind and pleading to Him some separate act of His Redeeming Love. Why should not, amid these, our Lord's Prayer, or that earnest devotion of our own Prayer Book, "O Saviour of the World," &c. be said alternately? If any like not this or any other form of devotion, I have recommended them, not to force themselves[9], and not to use it.

Let me set down three stanzas in explanation.

"JESU[1], from Thy grave upraisèd,
Gladdening sight to hearts amazèd,
Bidding fear and sorrow flee:
Grant, from sin's black sleep awaking,
From my soul earth's grave clothes shaking,
I may Thee in beauty see.
O Saviour of the world (*as above*).

"JESU, Who Thy servants' talk
Joinest in their mournful walk,
Knowing all, Thyself unknown:
Be Thou ever, Lord, beside me,
With Thine eye and counsel guide me
In the heart's deep converse shown.
O Saviour of the world.

"JESU, Thou Thy triumph ended,
To the Heaven of Heavens ascended,
Tak'st the Crown Thy pains have won:
Oh, that I Thyself may gain,
Cheer my course, my steps sustain,
Till my earthly race be run.
O Saviour of the world."

To myself, this interchange of the hymns, and the earnest prayer in prose, would make the whole more devotional than the uninterrupted, rapid transition from the subject of one stanza to that of another; in which

[9] Advertisement to the Paradise, p. xii.
[1] Paradise, § vi. p. 58.

way each succeeding thought often effaces that which preceded it.

I may insert here what I said on this in my Preface to that Part:—

"Almost the only alteration in this Part is the substitution either of the Gloria Patri or of the solemn Invocation in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick; the former as a Thanksgiving to the Holy Trinity for the mystery of man's redemption; the latter a deep cry for mercy, especially at that last hour, to Himself, our Redeemer, by that love whereby He redeemed us. The object of these pauses in the different devotions in which they occur, is to concentrate the soul upon the previous mystery or act of our Blessed Lord's Life or Passion, in order that the meditation suggested may take deeper hold of the mind, and the heart, gathering itself up, pour itself out in more fervent love. For the rapid transition from one mystery to another, without any pause, would probably, for the most part, rather confuse the mind than penetrate deeply into it. It might even simply accustom it to the thoughts, and diminish the hope of awakening that deep yet tender reverence with which these mysteries should be dwelt upon. These sacred forms, then, whether prayer or praise, are no mere repetition, except so far as the object of the prayer is the same Saviour, the thanksgiving is the foretaste of the endless Alleluia to the Infinite Object of all love, and adoration, and praise, the Holy Trinity. The subject of prayer or praise is mentally varied by each stanza or collect; and the soul in each (as in our Litany) pleads to its Redeemer some fresh act of His own mercy; or (although in the same words) renders thanksgivings ever new as His mercies."

For these devotions I retained the title "rosary," because I found it. I hesitated about it, because it is so often connected with the use of the Ave-Maria. I finally kept it, because it was not necessarily connected with those devotions: those devotions were altogether excluded from my edition, and others substituted[2] for them. In the

[2] I did not say for what these were substitutions, lest I should

book itself, it was plain what was meant by a Rosary; and until this unexplained allusion to it, in Mr. Dodsworth's letter, no one misunderstood it. As for the use of the string of beads, called a Rosary, these devotions could not be used with them. They need no such external help, and do not even admit it.

Another form[3] of these devotions does allow of it, in that the same words are repeated ten times successively, "Hail, most sweet Lord, Jesus Christ, full of grace, with Thee is mercy! Blessed is Thy most holy Life, Thy Passion and Thy Blood which for us Thou sheddest—in Thy Circumcision; in Thine Agony," &c.

I might venture to say that none can tell whether such repetitions would or would not increase his devotion, without using them; nor does it follow, that, because they would not aid him, they would not be helpful to others.

But as to the actual "rosary," I may have been asked by some five or six persons, *who had them*, whether there was any harm in using them? I ascertained from these, what devotions they used with them, and that there was nothing in those devotions, foreign to the character of the English Church. I know not how I could discourage a form of devotion which they had found useful to them in fixing their attention. Private devotion is left free every where. Surely a priest would not be entitled to interfere with a form of devotion in itself indifferent, but through which the soul of the individual was more fixed upon God. But I myself never recommended the use of a rosary in this sense.

On the other hand, I have on different occasions in public, and very often in private, spoken against, discouraged, and prevented the use of any devotions except to God Alone. I may repeat here

suggest its use. It was chiefly the Ave-Maria, but also another Invocation of the Blessed Virgin.

[3] It has been noticed to me that, in the Rosary of the Holy Trinity, mentioned above, p. 97, the use of the actual Rosary is spoken of. This I had forgotten when writing the letter. But the principle there maintained remains the same. Persons cannot mean, under the word Rosary, to which they object, devotions taken from Holy Scripture and the Gloria Patri. [Ed. 2.]

what I said in the Preface to the Paradise, which I have already quoted, for which I have been already censured by some who have left the English Church.

"I have, in every case, omitted all mention of the Invocation of Saints. For, however it may be explained by Roman Catholic controversialists, to be no more than asking the prayers of members of Christ yet in the flesh, still, in use, it is plainly more; for no one would ask those in the flesh to 'protect us from the enemy,' 'receive us in the hour of death,' 'lead us to the joy of Heaven,' 'may thy [the Blessed Virgin] abundant love cover the multitude of sins,' 'heal my wounds, and to the mind which asketh thee, give the gifts of graces[4],' or use any of the *direct* prayers for graces which God Alone can bestow, which are common in Roman Catholic devotions to the Blessed Virgin. No one can look uncontroversially at such occasional addresses, as there are to martyrs in the fourth century, (and those chiefly prayers at their tombs through their intercession for miraculous aid of God) and such books as 'the Glories of Mary,' 'the Month of Mary,' and say that the character of the modern reliance on, and invocation of Saints was that of the Ancient Church. No one could (it should be thought) observe how through volumes of S. Augustine or S. Chrysostom, there is no mention of any reliance except on Christ Alone; and how in modern books, S. Mary is held out as '*the* refuge of sinners,' as having 'the goats committed to her, as Christ, the sheep,' as 'the throne of grace' to whom a sinner may have easier access than to Christ[5], and seriously say, that the ancient and modern teaching and prac-

[4] Or say, 'If I walk through the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for she is with me. If war arise against me, in this will I be confident If my father and mother forsake me, the Mother of my Lord shall take me up.'

[5] "Christ is not our Advocate only, but a Judge: and since the just is scarcely secure, how shall a sinner go to Him, as an Advocate? Therefore God has provided us of an advocatress, who is gentle and sweet, in whom nothing that is sharp is to be found."—Antonin. quoted by Taylor, Dissuasive, l. ii. 8.

tice are the same. *We* could preach whole volumes of the sermons of S. Augustine or S. Chrysostom to our people to their edification and without offence: were a Roman Catholic preacher to confine himself to their preaching, he would (it has been said among themselves) be regarded as 'indevout towards S. Mary,' as 'one whose religion was more of the head than of the heart.' The Editor, then, has not ventured even upon the outskirts of so vast a system, which, even according to Roman Catholic testimony which he has had, does practically occasion many uninstructed minds to stop short in the mediation of S. Mary, when Holy Scripture is not even alleged, (as no text for the invocation of saints either is or can be quoted by Roman Catholic controversialists,) and primitive antiquity is equally silent, (now that passages as to S. Mary once attributed to S. Athanasius, S. Augustine, S. Ephrem, S. Chrysostom, under the shadow of whose great names this system grew up, are acknowledged to be spurious,) and the language of great fathers (as S. Cyril of Alexandria) has to be explained away; there was no authority to which the Editor dared to yield his faith. Taught by the Church to receive that and that alone, as matter of faith, which was part of the 'good deposit,' 'once for all committed to the Saints,' and which had been held 'always, every where, and by all,' he did not venture to receive what was confessedly of a more recent origin, and whose tendency seemed at variance with Holy Scripture itself. While acknowledging the 'authority of the Church in controversies of faith,' (Art. XX.) he could not understand on what ground that vast system, as to S. Mary, could be rested, except that of a new revelation. 'Developement' must surely apply to the expression, not to the substance of belief. It must be the bringing out in words of what was always inwardly held; the securing of the old, not the addition of any thing new. However the language of the Church, on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, may have, in time, become more fixed and definite, any one would think it an impiety to imagine that S. John and S. Peter had not received, and did not deliver, all which has

ever since been believed. He 'who lay on Jesus' Breast,' and he on whose confession of faith the Church was built, could not be ignorant of any thing belonging to that faith [6]. Neither can it be believed that they withheld any thing belonging to that faith [7]. To imagine either, was, of old, accounted to be 'subjecting [8] Christ to reproach.' Yet, it seems inconceivable that S. Peter, S. John, and S. Paul should have believed what is now earnestly taught and believed upon authority *within* the Roman Church, as to the *present* office of the Blessed Virgin, or that, believing it, they could have written as (*e. g.*) S. Paul wrote through the Holy Ghost, in the Epistle to the Hebrews; or that, if Almighty God had willed it to be believed in the Church, it should have been so excluded from Holy Scripture, and the doctrine itself not have appeared for centuries. The editor then, in a former work, while excluding invocations, admitted what was involved in the word θεοτόκος, as sanctioned by an Œcumenical Council, to whose authority the English Church yields unquestioning submission. In the present he has omitted the whole second section 'of the Worship and Veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary!' And, generally, for members of the English Church, who desire the prayers of the departed, it has to him ever seemed safest to pray for them [9] to Him, 'of Whom and through Whom and to Whom are all things,' our God and our All, Who, according to the current Roman explanation also, reveals to them the desire of those below to have their prayers."

And now, my Lord, I might venture to ask any one who has read or repeated

[6] 'For after that our Lord arose from the dead, and they were endued with the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon them from on high, they were fully filled as to all things, and had perfect knowledge.' 'It is unlawful to say that they preached before they had perfect knowledge.' S. Iren. 3. 3. 1. 'According to these [the heretics] Peter was imperfect; imperfect also the other Apostles. And were they to live again, they must needs become the disciples of these, that they too may become perfect. But this were absurd.' Ib. 12. 7. See also in the same book ii. ult.

[7] Id. iii. 3. 5.

[8] Tert. de Præscr. Hær. c. 22.

[9] I meant "express the desire for those prayers to God."

this statement about me, whether they imagined that this was all which was meant by the use of "rosaries"—forms of devotion, addressed to the Holy Trinity, or to our Lord, pleading to Him His own Life and Sufferings and Death, that He should have mercy upon us, and forgive our sins, or give us His Graces?

Of the same nature, I doubt not, is the misapprehension as to "the use of crucifixes." A crucifix may either (1) be worn near the heart, to remind us of Jesus Christ and Him Crucified; or (2) it might be used to fix the attention, by the sight of his sufferings for us, or to move the affections of love and contrition, by beholding Him as crucified for love of us; or (3) it might be an object not of reverence only (as any representation of our Lord must be), but of worship. I suppose that this last is what would be commonly suggested to the minds of English people.

We, or at least English women, wear the pictures of those they love. The miniature portrait of a child is worn, full often, in memory of one out of sight. Is it then a strange thing, that Christians should wear, unseen by man, the Human resemblance of Him Who died for them, to remind them, by its very touch, Whose they are, Whom they should obey, recalling their forgetfulness, (even as does the grave look of an elder friend,) or, speaking to them, without words, unheard by others, reminding them of His love for them, that Christ died for us sinners?

The objection cannot be merely to representations of our Lord. *Pictures* of the Crucifixion abound every where. If any representation of our Lord were wrong, all would be. None are wrong in themselves. This is what I thought it right to explain. While substituting in "the Spiritual Combat," the words "representation of Christ Crucified" for "Crucifix," in order to suggest rather the use of pictures, I said, "Neither[1] the use of the Crucifix, nor of the pictures of the Crucifixion, which are more common among ourselves, can be in any

[1] Spiritual Combat, p. 198, note, ed. 2.

way regarded as contrary to the second Commandment, when used to set before the eyes the Divine love and Sufferings of our Crucified Lord. For what is forbidden in that Commandment is to make for ourselves any likeness of God: but to represent Christ Crucified is but to exhibit the Human Form which for us and our salvation He Himself took."

It may remove the prejudice of some, that in this I had the remarkable concurrence of Dr. Arnold [2]. who was naturally biassed in quite a contrary direction, yet was so alive to the truthful impressions of human nature.

I do indeed think that it is unwise and uncharitable needlessly to go against even mistaken prejudices. And for this very purpose I substituted, as I said, the words "a representation of Christ Crucified" for "the Crucifix." Strange it is, that while, not the Lutheran only, but the united Lutheran and Reformed bodies in Prussia, have the Crucifix upon their Communion Table, the very name of a Crucifix amongst us awakens only thoughts of idolatrous worship. There can, in principle, be no difference between the Picture of the Crucifixion and the Figure of Christ Crucified; both alike set before our eyes Christ Crucified; the picture ordinarily, by aid of colour, sets forth His Sacred Form and Countenance, and the Eyes which seem almost to look on those who look on Him, more vividly to the mind. Yet pictures of the Crucifixion are received and beheld by all with reverence and love; the Crucifix, with dread of some wrong design in it.

This feeling, although

[2] Life of Dr. Arnold. (Quoted by Mr. Bennett, Letter to Lord J. Russell, p. 36, 37.) Dr. Arnold says, too broadly indeed, "the second commandment is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation." This it is not, for worship would be forbidden now as then. But Dr. Arnold limits his words in the context (as I did myself) to the making to ourselves representations of Almighty God, although the language is somewhat crude. "God (he says) has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself, when He declared Himself in the Person of Christ." He who had seen the Son in the Flesh had seen the Father; yet then, too, they saw only "the Form of a servant," which God the Son took, not His Invisible Godhead, nor any "similitude of the Father."

inconsistent, I thought it right to respect. I could not, when asked, but say (as I said in the note above quoted, and as Dr. Arnold said), that the Crucifix in itself was not forbidden by the second Commandment; for the second Commandment forbids us to make to ourselves any likeness of the invisible God; the Crucifix represents not the Son, in His Invisible Deity, but in "the Form of a servant," which He took for us, and in which "He became obedient unto Death, and that, the Death of the Cross." Nor do I know any thing to forbid an English clergyman, either to wear such a memorial of His Crucified Lord himself, or to give it to others to wear, not ostentatiously, but unseen by man, to recall the thought of Himself to them. But further, neither can I think it wrong for any one to pray, either with a picture of our Lord Crucified, or a Crucifix before him, so that it be used only to fix and deepen our thoughts of His Dying Love, and make it present to us. This also I have said, when asked. But as to this also, I have always spoken of the charity due to the prejudices of others.

I need not say to your Lordship, that, not images, but the worship of images was forbidden either by the Council of Frankfort to which we appeal, or by the English Church. The Article says expressly "worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques." Natural actions, tokens of love (such as Dr. Arnold speaks of[3], and "rather envied the child," who, in simple devotion to its Lord, used them) are not "worship or adoration." Who has not seen one kiss the picture of one loved but absent? Who, well-nigh, has not done it? If then, any one, following the outward gesture of St. Mary Mag-

[3] "In the crypt is a Calvary and figures as large as life, representing the burying of our Lord. The woman who showed us the crypt had her little girl with her, and she lifted up the child, about three years old, to kiss the feet of our Lord. Is this idolatry? Nay, verily it may be so; but it need not be, and assuredly is *in itself right and natural*. I confess I rather envied the child."—Dr. Arnold's Life, ii. 402, quoted by Mr. Bennett. In the context Dr. Arnold says, very unguardedly, "It is idolatry to talk about holy Church," but Dr. Arnold, of course, meant a supposed abuse, not to condemn the Apostles' Creed.

dalene, and in outward act, figuring himself like her, were to kiss this likeness of his Lord's Feet, I own, I could not count the action superstitious, nor to imply a temper alien from the English Church.

I do believe, my Lord, that in this great conflict, in which the hearts of the people are to be won back to the depth of "the truth as it is in Christ Jesus," it is the part of Christian love to avoid, as far as it is consistent with the full maintenance of the truth, what may deter others from receiving it. We have to win hearts by the grace of God, and the power of His Spirit, and the might of His truth, and may well forego all which is not necessary. I did not wish to promote the use of Crucifixes, in the popular sense of that use. But I have seen, my Lord, in most excruciating pain, which flesh and blood could not have endured, how deep a comfort the well-known picture of the Crucifixion, by Guido, has been to the sufferer; how the eye, instead of rolling in agony, has rested in peace on that Sacred Form. "What are my sufferings compared to His?" has been the simple answer of the sufferer after a night of agony. "And we indeed justly:" has echoed in many a heart, in sight of the likeness of the outstretched and racked Form of JESUS. I have known how the dying sufferer has felt like the forgiven robber by our Lord's side. I have known how, when the mind could in feverish illness form no prayer, the sight of a picture of Christ Crucified has been the one means of gathering the thoughts to Him, and been instead of books of prayer which the brain could no longer receive, or the ear hear. I have known it the outward support of months and years of intense suffering, and of the pains of death; how suffering has been sanctified by the ever-present sight of those sanctifying Sufferings; or how, in life, its presence has quickened the conscience, not to act unworthily of Him, or crucify Him again, our Crucified Lord.

I have not, then, thought it wrong, my Lord, to give a Crucifix to be worn within, upon the chest. I may myself have given it, in some years, to some twelve or twenty friends who wished so to wear it. Since

pictures of the Crucifixion, with all the aid of colour, are recognized in our Churches, I know not upon what principle I could take upon myself to think or declare a Crucifix unlawful, so that it became not an object of worship or a cause of scandal. It is not of my own choice that I now defend the lawful use of them thus publicly.

And yet it cannot but be natural to every Christian heart, to love to behold representations of his Crucified Lord. It cannot, dare not, need apology, or defence. The principle, I must repeat, is the same, whether we represent the Nativity, the Flight into Egypt, our Lord's obedience to His parents, His Baptism, Miracles, Teaching, Blessing little children, or His Agony or Crucifixion. In each and all, it is "the Word become Flesh and dwelling among us."

Yet these are subjects, now chosen for religious distribution, "among the middling classes, the poor Charity Schools, and Church Missionary Societies," and to take a slight indication of the same return to natural feeling among the dissenters also, I have, while writing this, seen a recent edition of Bogatzky's Golden Treasury, with the Crucifixion represented as by old painters, with St. John, His Mother, and St. Mary Magdalene, at its foot, and on the opposite page, a female figure, kneeling, and praying towards the Cross which she is holding in her hand. Under the picture of the Crucifixion, there occur these lines—

> "Here at Thy Cross, my dying God,
> I lay my soul beneath Thy love;
> *Beneath the droppings of Thy Blood*,
> Jesus, nor shall it e'er remove.
>
> "Should worlds conspire to drive me thence,
> Moveless and firm this heart should lie,
> Resolved (for that's my last defence)
> If I must perish, there to die."

Nature is truer and more devout than theory or controversy.

[Another example comes recommended to us by the memory of a name which Isaac Walton's simple narrative has embalmed to many of us, a Divine of much weight in his day, and highly

esteemed yet for the freshness of his piety, Dr. Donne. "Not long before his death," says Walton [4], "he caused to be drawn a figure of the Body of Christ extended upon an anchor [5], like those which painters draw when they would present us with the picture of Christ crucified on the Cross; his, varying no otherwise than to affix him not to a cross, but to an anchor (the emblem of hope); this he caused to be drawn in little, and then many of those figures thus drawn, to be engraven very small in Helitropian stones, and set in gold; and of these he sent to many of his dearest friends, to be used as seals, or rings, and kept as memorials of him, and of his affection to them."

Another account adds, that "at Mr. George Herbert's death, these verses were found wrapped up with that seal which was by the Doctor given to him:—

> "When winds and waves rise highest, I am sure:
> *This* anchor keeps my faith, *that* me, secure [6]."]

[4] Life of Dr. John Donne, p. 75, 76.

[5] Of which Dr. Donne would often say, "Crux mihi anchora," The Cross is my anchor. Remains of George Herbert, p. xxvi.

[6] Ib. pp. xxvi. xxvii.

VI. The statement proceeds,—"and" [by recommending] "special devotions to our Lord, as *e. g.* to His Five Wounds."

I own I was surprised, my Lord, when I first heard these devotions objected to, as something Roman. They can have nothing in common with any thing peculiar to the Roman system. They are founded on the doctrine of the Incarnation, the union of our Blessed Lord's two Natures in His One Divine Person. They are borne out by the words of Holy Scripture, "the Blood of God."

Those words, also, of the Prophet Zechariah, "What are these wounds in Thy Hands? Then He shall answer, Those with which I have been wounded in the house of My friends," have been in a secondary sense interpreted of Him, the thought of Whom was ever in the minds of the Prophets, and, still more, "the testimony of" Whom "is the spirit of prophecy." The next words speak of the Death of our Lord and God, of that Man, Who is, as God, the Equal of the Lord of Hosts. "Awake, O sword, against My shepherd, and against the Man Who is My Fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts."

The piercing of the Hands and the Feet is especially pointed out in that deep Psalm of the sufferings of our Lord, the 22nd: surely, not *only* to foretel a fact and the mode of His suffering; but that we may, in repeating the Psalm, dwell in adoring love on the details of His Passion which He endured for us.

"Christ's Passion," says St. Augustine, "is set forth as clearly as the Gospel." We behold Him, speak of Him, in His Very Person, just as if we were on Mount Calvary, and were, with the Beloved Disciple, standing by His Cross. The Holy Ghost, in the Psalms, puts into our own mouths the Sufferings of our Lord, that we may reverently suffer with Him. Whose heart, I may ask, has not, at some time at least, ached, when he

repeated the words, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken ME?" And then the Psalm tells of His Sufferings, not as beheld only, as the Gospels do, but as endured, as felt by Him Who for us endured them. It tells us not only in our Lord's own Person, of the Piercing the Hands and the Feet, and how He was naked there, "I may tell all My Bones;" the mocking of those who stood by, the very words which they so strangely fulfilled by using them; His thirst, "My tongue cleaveth to My gums;" the parting His raiment and casting lots upon His Vesture; but it even sets before our eyes one detail which must have been true, but is not mentioned in the Gospels, the racking and dislocating of His Human Frame upon the Cross: "All My Bones are out of joint," literally, "are severed one from the other." But, besides this, the picture-like character of the Psalm is observable. The Gospels mention the "wagging the head;" the Psalmist fills up the picture: "All they that see Me, laugh Me to scorn: they shoot out their lips, and shake their heads;" and "They gape upon Me with their mouths," "They stand staring and looking upon me." It pictures too His Blessed Form, (as the ancient painters were wont, perhaps from this Psalm, to represent it,) dried up and emaciated: "My strength is dried up like a potsherd." "I may tell all My Bones." It tells us, as from Himself, what cannot be pictured, the Anguish which he allowed to affect His Human Heart, "My Heart in the midst of My Body is even like melting wax," that our hearts may reverently feel with His, because He endured for love of us.

Surely when our Lord's Sufferings are so set before us, both in the Psalm and in the Gospels, it must be meant that we should dwell upon each portion of them, upon every pang which entered into them.

"Such," I said, "is the real contemplation of love. Think we not that such must it have been to those who were on Calvary, love riveting them, while each awful infliction pierced the soul with a sword, and upholding them to endure the pain it gave? But since His love comprehended us, as though we were there,

and He beheld us, one by one, from the Cross, and loved us, and shed that precious Blood for us, and each pang was a part of the Price of our Redemption, how must not a living faith, 'the evidence of things unseen,' be present with Him, and behold the Crucifixion, not 'afar off,' but as brought by the Holy Gospels to the very foot of the Cross, and, if not standing there with His Blessed Mother and the beloved Disciple, yet kneeling at least with the penitent who embraces It? To Love, nothing is of small account. Human love finds a separate ground of love, a separate meaning and expression of that inward, holy loveliness which wins it, impressed on every part even of the pure visible frame of what it loves. Grief loves to recall each separate action, and token of love or holiness, and muses upon them, and revolves them on all sides, to discover the varied bearings of what yet is finite. How much more when the Object of Contemplation is Infinite, and that of love! When the Passion was 'the book of the Saints,' they contemplated it letter by letter, and combined its meanings, and explored its unfathomable depths, the depths of the riches of the mercy and loving-kindness of God; each Wound had its own treasure-house of the depths of Divine mercy, its own antidote to sin. They, in spirit, 'reached forth their finger, and beheld His Hands,' mightier to aid, because bound to the tree; they felt themselves encircled within the outstretched, all-encompassing Arms of His Mercy; they fell at His wearied and stiffened Knees, and their own 'feeble knees' were strengthened; they bathed with tears His transfixed Feet, that so He might forgive the mournful liberty and wandering wherewith their own had gone astray; but chiefly were they ever drawn to the very Abyss of His unsearchable Love, His pierced Side and His opened Heart, there to 'draw of the fountains of salvation,' to 'drink that water, after which they should never thirst' for aught beside; there reverently to 'enter, and to penetrate to the inmost recesses of His boundless Charity,' to 'enter into Its Chambers, and close its doors about them,' there to 'hide them in the secret of His Presence' from the

wrath to come. They wearied not of contemplating His Wounds, His healing Stripes, His Words, because the unutterable love, of which they were the tokens, being Infinite, there issues from them an infinite attractiveness of love. And we may now behold those Wounds, not merely in their extreme humility and painfulness, but glorified; and Tabor and Calvary are united, and 'the lifting up from the earth' has been the Ascension to Glory, and His sacred Wounds have of the capacity of His Godhead: and His Heart, which is ever open to receive us, can contain the sorrows, and hide and heal the sins of the whole human race."

I need not say to your Lordship, (but some in these days may need to be reminded,) that the Humanity of our Lord, being united in one Person with His Divinity, is One Object of adoration with His Godhead. To others I may say, this doctrine lies in the words of Holy Scripture. "When He bringeth the Only Begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him." "This," says St. Chrysostom[1], "is not said of God the Word, but of Christ according to the flesh. For since he was in the world, as St. John saith, and the world was 'made by Him,' how was he brought in, otherwise than in the Flesh?" And other Fathers[2] observe on the same word, "brought in," that "before the Incarnation, He had nothing in common with the creature, as being God without flesh. But when he took flesh, then, having something in common with the creature, in that He united with Himself something created, He is said to be brought into the world."

Again, when St. Paul says of our Lord, "that God very highly exalted Him, and gave Him a Name above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," this must relate to His Human Nature. As God, Coequal and Co-eternal with the Father, He was ever in his Everlasting, Unchangeable Glory, which could as

[1] Ad loc. quoted by Petav. de Incarn. xv. 4.
[2] S. Greg. Nyss. and S. Cyril. Al. ap. Theophyl. ad loc.

little admit of increase as of diminution. For God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, IS unchangeably That HE IS. They are not three Gods, but One God. He did not, in His Incarnation, narrow Himself within the Body which, for our sakes, He took, so as not to be, as God, every where. He said of Himself when on earth, "the Son of Man, Who *is* in Heaven." "In that[3] He is the Word, He is in heaven; in that He is Flesh, He is the Son of Man; in that He is the Word made Flesh, He is both of Heaven, and the Son of Man, and is in Heaven; because, first, the Power of the Word, abiding in no corporeal way, was not absent there, from whence It had come down; and the Flesh had received its origin from no other source than from the Word; and the Word made Flesh, whereas it was Flesh, did not, however, cease to be the Word also." And again, "Where I am, ye cannot come." "For," says St. Augustine[4], "Christ was according to His Visible Flesh, on earth; according to His invisible Majesty, both in Heaven and in earth." To God the Son, the Father gave no glory; for He ever was in the Glory of the Father, "the Glory equal, the Majesty Coeternal." It is then His Manhood, inseparable from His Godhead, before which all creation bows, Angels, Archangels, men and devils, in reverence or in terror.

So also they who, when He in the flesh dwelt among us, adored Him, adored Him not as man without the Godhead, nor yet the Godhead apart from the Manhood, when they fell down at Jesus' Feet and worshipped Him. "We adore not," says St. Athanasius[5], "a created thing, God forbid! Such an error is for heathen and Arians. But we worship the Lord of the creation, the Word of God, incarnate. For although the flesh by itself is a part of creatures, yet it hath become the Body of God. And neither do we, severing such a Body from the Word, worship It by Itself; nor when we would worship the Word, do we set Him apart from the Flesh;

[3] S. Hil. de Trin. x. 16.
[4] Tract. 31, in Joh. (vii. 34).
[5] Ep. ad Adelph. § 3, p. 912; ed. Bened.

but knowing, as we said before, that 'the Word was made Flesh,' we acknowledge Him, even when come in the Flesh, to be God. Who then is so senseless, as to say to the Lord, 'Remove from the Flesh, that I may worship Thee?' or who so ungodly, as with the senseless Jews to say to Him on account of the Body, 'Why dost Thou, being Man, make Thyself God?' But not such was the leper. For he worshipped God being in the Flesh, and knew that He was God, saying, 'Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.' And neither on account of the Flesh did he think the Word of God a creature, nor because the Word is the Maker of all creation, did he set at nought the Flesh wherewith He was clad; but, as in a created temple, he worshipped the Creator of all, and was cleansed. So too the woman with an issue of blood, having believed, and only touched His hem, was healed; and the sea foaming up with its waves heard the Incarnate Word, and ceased its tempest; and the blind from his birth was healed through the spittle of the Flesh by the Word. And what is still greater and more wondrous, (for this too, perchance, offended those most ungodly); even when the Lord hung upon the Cross itself (for It was *His* Body and the Word was in It) 'the sun was darkened, and the earth trembled, and the rocks were rent, and the vail of the temple was rent, and many bodies of the saints who slept, arose.'

"For[6] neither doth Creation worship a creature; nor again on account of the Flesh did it excuse itself from adoring its Lord, but it beheld its own Creator in the Body; and 'at the Name of Jesus Christ did every knee bow, yea, and shall bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess (though the Arians think not good) that Jesus Christ is Lord in the glory of God the Father.' For the Flesh brought no disgrace to the Word; God forbid! but rather Itself was glorified from Him."

"Where[7] shall those ungodly find by Itself that

[6] Ep. ad Adelph. § 4.

[7] Ib. § 5.

Flesh which the Saviour took, that they may venture to say, 'We do not worship the Lord with the Flesh; but we separate the Flesh, and worship Him alone?' Assuredly, the blessed Stephen saw the Lord in Heaven standing at the Right Hand; and the Angels said to His disciples, 'He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into Heaven.'

"We[8] know that 'in the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.' Him, having also become Man for our salvation, we worship, not as one equal, because become Man in a Body of equal nature, but as the Lord, having taken in addition the Form of a servant, and the Maker and Creator having come to be in the creature, that having in it delivered all, He might bring the world to the Father, and make all at peace, both the things in Heaven and the things on earth. For thus we both acknowledge His Godhead with the Father, and we worship His Incarnate Presence."

A Pious mind, then, cannot but, with great reverence, think of those Blessed Wounds, through which its own redemption was wrought by Him Who, being "God and Man, was One Christ," "not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God."

[On this subject, too, I am glad to add passages of Dean Jackson[9], in which he expands those amazing words, "The Blood of God."

"10. The Flesh and Blood which He [the Son of God] assumed and was partaker of, are as truly human, as man's flesh and blood are, and of the self-same nature that man's flesh and blood are of. And of such flesh He was to be as truly, as properly partaker, as we are. And yet it is necessary that the same flesh and blood which He assumed, be as truly and as properly the flesh and blood of the Son of God (who is by Nature God blessed for ever) as our flesh is the flesh, or our blood the blood of the sons of men. Otherwise, albeit the flesh and blood assumed by Him had been as truly, and as properly human flesh and blood

[8] Ep. ad Adelph. § 8. [9] On the Creed, B. 7. s. 3. § 10, sqq.

as ours is; yet could not the Son of God have been as true and proper a partaker of human flesh and blood as we sons of men are. For no party or person can as truly and really participate with another in that which is not his own by perfect right, as it is the other's who is partaker of it with him. So then the Flesh and Blood of our Saviour Christ was truly and properly *Caro humana, non divina; sanguis humanus, non divinus*, not divine, but human flesh and blood; and yet withal as truly and properly *Caro Dei*, and *Sanguis Dei*, the flesh and blood of God, as it was *caro humana, sanguis humanus*, human flesh, and human blood: more properly the flesh and blood of God than the flesh and blood of man. For even the whole Humanity of Christ, as well the reasonable soul as the flesh, was and is the Humanity of the Son of God. *God* saith the Apostle (Acts xx. 28.) *hath purchased the Church, τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι with His own proper Blood.* Now if the Church be God's own, not by Creation only but by true purchase; then the Blood by which He purchased it, was as truly His own, as our blood, or any thing within us, or without us, which we can own, is ours. But was it God's own Blood, after the self-same manner or measure that our blood is ours? It was not in every respect, or after every manner His own so as our blood is ours; yet His own by a more proper, more full and sovereign title than our blood is any way ours.

"11. Our flesh and blood may be said to be our own in two respects, either as it is a part of our nature, or an appurtenance of our person. In this last respect the Fruit of the Virgin's Womb was the Son of God's own substance, the flesh and blood which He took from her were His, after a more exquisite manner, or in a fuller measure of the same manner, than our flesh and blood are our own. Our flesh, our blood, our limbs, are said to be our own, not so much or not so properly as they are parts of our nature, as in that they are either parts or appurtenances of our persons. That which is immediately annext or linkt unto our person, is by a more peculiar and soveraign right our own, than any thing whatsoever besides we do

possess, or are Lords of; be it Lands, Goods,or Servants. For whatsoever we possess, being not thus annexed unto our persons, are but externals, their possession is communicable, their property may be so alienated, as others may make as good use of them as we do. A man may be wronged in every thing that is his own, whereof he is by just title possessed, but the wrongs done to a man in externals, do not touch him so nearly as the wrongs done to his person, or to any part or appurtenance of it . . . Genenerally, whether we speak of men's actions or sufferings undertaken for our behoof, to the loss of blood or limbs; we are not to value the one or other so much according to the physical property, or natural worth of the member lost or damnified, as according to the dignity of the person which voluntarily undertaketh such hard services for us. And thus we are to rate as well the indignities and pains which our Saviour suffered in body by the Jews or Roman souldiers, as the anguish of his soul in that great conflict with the powers of darkness, neither according to the excellency of His bodily constitution, or exquisite purity of His soul, but according to the inestimable dignity of His Divine Person, of which, as well His immaculate Soul, as his undefiled Body were no natural parts, but appurtenances only.

"Lastly, That proper Blood, wherewith God is said to have purchased the Church, was the Blood of the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, after a more peculiar manner than it was the Blood either of God the Father, or of God the Holy Ghost. It was the Blood of God the Father, or of God the Holy Ghost, as all other creatures are by the common right of creation and preservation. It was the Blood of God the Son Alone by personal union. If this Son of God, and High Priest of our souls, had offered any other Sacrifice for us than Himself, or the Manhood thus personally united unto Him, His offering could not have been satisfactory; because in all other things created, the Father and the Holy Ghost had the same right or interest which the Son had; He could not have offered any thing to Them which were not as truly Theirs as His. Only the Seed of Abraham, or fruit of the Virgin's

Womb, which He assumed into the Godhead, was by the assumption made so His own, as it was not Theirs, His own by incommunicable property of personal Union. By reason of this incommunicable property in the woman's seed, the Son of God might truly have said unto His Father, 'Lord, Thou hast purchased the Church yet with My Blood:' but so could not the man Christ Jesus say unto the Son of God. 'Lord, Thou hast paid the ransom for the sins of the world, yet with My Blood, not with Thine own.'"

[This Blood was shed for us in each of His Precious Bloodsheddings. Dr. Jackson says, in another place:[1] "Though Christ then was truly mortal when He died for us, yet the Blood that He shed forth for us, at His Death, did not become like water spilt upon the ground, which cannot be gathered again. It did not vanish or consume as the blood of legal Sacrifices did. As His Body, so His Blood was, not to see or feel corruption. Not a drop of Blood which was shed for us, whether in the garden or upon the Cross, but was the Blood of the Son of God; but was shed by Him, as willing at this price to become the Everlasting High-Priest of our souls; and not a drop of Blood which was so shed, did cease, or shall ever cease to be the Blood of the Son of God. His Soul and Body, we know, were disunited by death; yet were neither of them disunited from His Godhead or Divine Person. His Body, whilst laid in the grave, was still the Body of the Son of God, as still retaining personal union with His Godhead. So was His Soul, so was His Blood, the Soul and Blood of the Son of God, as being indissolubly united to His Divine Person. Though His Blood, whilst It was shed or poured out, did lose its physical or local union with His Body, though one portion of it were divided from another, yet no drop of it was divided from His Infinite Person." "Whether all and every portion of His Blood which was then shed, were, by the power of the Godhead, re-collected and reunited to His Body, as His Body was to His Soul at the resurrection, we cannot tell; God knows. But this

[1] Book x. ch. 55. § 10, 11. p. 300, l, 12.

we know and believe, that the self-same Blood which was then shed, whether it were gathered together again, or remained dispersed, whether it were re-united to His glorified Body or divided from it, is still united to the Fountain of Life, to the Godhead in the Person of the Son. And being united to this Fountain of Life (who dwelleth in it, as light within the body of the sun), it is of efficacy everlasting; it hath an immortal power or force to dissolve the works of Satan in us, as well those which he worketh in us after Baptism as before. The virtue of it, to cleanse and purge us from our sins (of what kind soever) is, at this day, as sovereign as if It had been sprinkled upon our souls whilst It issued out of His Body. It is impossible it should lose its vertue in or upon our souls, unless we first lose our interest in it, which we cannot lose but by abandoning the ways of light, and polluting our souls with the works of darkness. For so long as 'we walk in the light, the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God, doth cleanse us from all our sins.'"

This present efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood upon our souls, or real communication of both, I find as a truth unquestionable amongst the Ancient Fathers, and as a Catholic Confession.]

My Lord, there is one very solemn subject to which I must refer, in connexion with this, belonging to the deepest mystery of our Redemption, how Holy Scripture lays especial weight not upon the Death of our Lord only, but upon the shedding of His Blood. To your Lordship I need not say, how through the Old Testament in type, and the Epistle to the Hebrews very specially, in reality, the shedding of Blood is insisted upon, as that which is atoning: "By the Death of One many became righteous." But the mode of that Atoning Death, as typified by God's appointment, from the very gates of Paradise, was by the shedding of Blood. This was the special ground why the Blood was to be shed on the earth like water, not to be eaten. It is the life of the brute creation, which was offered to God, as an atonement for sin, and a type of the Blood of Christ. All sacrifices, types of the Atoning Sacrifice, (except the scape-goat, which was an

image of the sin being carried quite away,) were with shedding of the blood. St. Paul sums up in few words the varied Hebrew ritual, which yet, because it was varied, set the more continually before the eyes, that "without shedding of blood there was no remission." The animal varied: it was bullock, or heifer, or ram, or goat, or lamb, or turtle-dove, or pigeon. But in all alike the blood was shed. The mode of offering the blood was various. It was sprinkled on the four corners of the Altar, or upon the side of the Altar, or poured forth at its base; in the Holy Place, or in the Holy of holies; on the altar of incense within the Holy Place, or upon, or before the Mercy seat; or (in the case of the red heifer simply) "towards the tabernacle of the congregation seven times;" or it was sprinkled or put upon the priest himself, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments, or the people, or upon the lepers, or those with issues, or on the leprous house. St. Paul adds that "he sprinkled the book of the law," as well as the people, "saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry: And almost all things are by the law purged with blood: and without shedding of blood is no remission[3]." That which was sprinkled every where, was Blood. The ends of the sacrifices were various; the Passover, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering, the sin-offering of ignorance, for the priest, the congregation, the ruler, or the private person, the trespass-offering or the sin-offering; but in all the blood was sprinkled. And so we come to the New Testament, the substance of these shadows, to Him Whom through these shadows, the devout under the law looked on to, and was justified by his faith in Him Who was to come. And there, there meet us, not only that actual Sacrifice, and the history of His Precious Blood-shedding in the Gospels, but all the statements of the efficacy, not of the Death only, but of the Blood of Christ.

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation

[3] Heb, ix. 20—22.

through faith in His Blood." "Much more then, being now justified by His Blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." "In whom we have redemption, through His Blood." "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were far off, were made nigh by the Blood of Christ." "And, having made peace through the Blood of His Cross, by Him, to reconcile all things unto Himself." "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own Blood, He entered in once into the holy place." "How much more shall the Blood of Christ, Who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the Blood of Jesus." "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing?" "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the Blood of the everlasting covenant." "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ." "And the Blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His Own Blood." "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy Blood[4]."

This will be to all very plain. It is in every one's lips: may it be in their hearts! But what I think that they who speak carelessly about, or against those devotions, do not dwell upon, is, "Whence did this atoning Blood flow?" It was the very characteristic of that Death, by which our Blessed Lord said that He should die, which the Psalmist foretold long before, that His Hands and Feet should be pierced, and out of them flowed that Redeeming Blood. It was out of those

[4] Rom. iii. 25; v. 9. Eph. ii. 13; i. 7. Col. i. 20. Heb. ix. 12. 14; x. 19. 29; xiii. 20. 1 Pet. i. 2. 1 John i. 7. Rev. i. 5; v. 9.

very Wounds, and those alone, which some would now forbid us to love, or to speak of, or to reverence, or to plead, one by one, to Him or to His Father. "The Precious Blood of Christ," of which Holy Scripture speaks, on which God Himself, from the very fall, fixed the eyes and the faith of our fallen race, is not a mere metaphor, (as the Socinians would have it). But since there was a special value in that precious Bloodshedding, must not those Wounds, opened for us, out of which it was shed, be precious in our sight? It is to be said, too, that since that meritorious Bloodshedding must, in order to be meritorious, have been during His life, it was from His Sacred Hands and Feet and Head alone. When the Blood flowed mysteriously, and as a hidden mystery, from His Side, "it was finished." "Finished" was the atonement for sin. And yet then too, that flowing of His Blood with the water was a deep mystery, as Holy Scripture itself has so solemnly pointed out. It was a mystery not for that time only, but to abide. The Beloved Disciple, who says, "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His Side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water: and he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe," says also of the same, "There are three who bear record"—not who *bore* record, but who *bear* record (οἱ μαρτυροῦντες) "on earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood; and these three agree in one"; and by which He still "cometh," viz. by Water and Blood, the two sacraments through the Spirit[5].

It has been by an instinctive reverence and love, that moderns have been drawn most to the Wound in His Sacred Side, because, if it pierced not, it was nighest to, His Heart. That Sacred Side, as Holy Scripture has pointed out, had its own mystery. Its mystery was, (as the Ancient Church saw,) that those streams, which gushed forth thence, were the earnest of the mysteries through which our redemption is conveyed *to us*, in that we are, through those mysteries, the two great Sacraments, united to our Lord. From Himself

[5] See further, Scriptural Doctrine of Holy Baptism, p. 293 sqq.

went forth "the Water whereby we are regenerated, the Blood whereby we are nourished [6]." But the Blood, through which, Holy Scripture speaks, "we have redemption, even the remission of our sins," had been poured out before, when He Himself willingly shed it for us in His Life.

This is the principle of the devotions, which have been animadverted upon. This is their object, to dwell, one by one, on those wide-open Wounds, out of which, for our Redemption, He poured out His Blood; to meditate on each shedding of His Blood, from "His Holy Circumcision," to the Blood and Water, which mysteriously flowed forth from His Side when He had given up the Ghost. To use again words which I said, in some explanation of them:—"It may be said, also, that the forms of devotion, with reference to the several precious Wounds of our Lord, or the sheddings of His Atoning Blood, although hitherto unwonted among us, will, in this way of meditation, sink deeply into our hearts. Let any one bear in mind those words of Holy Scripture, 'the Blood of God,' knowing also that in our Lord Christ the Godhead and Manhood were united in One Person, so that in each act He was 'God Who made us, and Man Who sought us; God with the Father ever, Man with us in time; yet so Man as not to cease to be God,'—let any one, with this Article of our Faith deeply impressed, use meditatively these devotions to our Lord, seeing Him with the eyes of his soul, enlightened by His Spirit, on the very Cross, and he will find in them an intensity of melting yet hallowing devotion, bringing him to touch, handle, hide himself in those openings of His love, admitting him very reverently to touch His very Sacred Person, the prints of His nails, and His pierced Side, and in them to find unutterable peace and healing."

"Not a sparrow," our Lord saith, "falleth to the ground without your Father." Since, then, as matter of faith, nothing happens, even to *us*, without the Will and Eternal knowledge of God, how must we not think of all which was done in and towards that Body, which God the Son

[6] St. Chrys. ad loc.

inseparably united with Himself, at that awful hour of our Redemption, as unspeakably full of meaning! It was, then, part of the Eternal Counsel of God, according to which "the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world," that He, in the form of a Servant, should there receive those five Wounds for us. Can it be wrong for Christians, "bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh," to dwell reverently, one by one, on each act or suffering of that Redeeming love? Again, it has been observed by thoughtful persons, that there were especially seven occasions upon which He shed that Precious Blood. "The Circumcision of our Lord" our Church keeps holy, that first early prelude of a life of woe for us. Then Holy Scripture specially records how in His Agony there burst from His Sacred Body great drops of Blood, falling to the ground. Again, Holy Scripture, in fact, speaks of the Blood-shedding in His scourging, when it says, "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed." Again, the Blood must have streamed from His Sacred Head when they plaited the Crown of thorns and put it on His Head, and struck Him with a reed. And when His garments, which had again been "put upon Him," that they might "lead Him away to crucify Him," and which were matted to His Sacred Body by the weight of the Cross, were now rudely torn off from Him, there could not but follow the Blood from the re-opened Wounds. Then was the Crucifixion, for which he was thus anew bared: and the piercing of His Side.

If any are more drawn to contemplate our Blessed Lord in His Infancy, as at this season, or where He sits in glory at the Right Hand of God, it does not hinder them that others behold Him in His Passion. But since these special sheddings of His Blood are contained in Holy Scripture, and since the number seven is used, as a mystery, not only throughout the ritual appointed by God Himself in the Old Testament, but in the Revelations also, why may not those who find nourishment for their devotion in it, reverently dwell on those seven effusions of their Redeemer's Blood,

from the Body, which is and was the Body of God, and in which "He bare our sins upon the Tree?"

My Lord, let us quit for a little space all this tumult of these latter times, and turn aside to a scene, perhaps of scarcely more tumult and more sin, but where there is One Form in Whom to find rest. He, Who in that mangled Form, rent by the Bloody Stripes through which we are healed, is stretched out upon the Cross, "in Whom there is now no form or comeliness," so "marred is He more than man, and His Form more than the sons of men," is our God, "for us and for our salvation" become Man. "He was offered, because he willed." That Hand, so often stretched forth in Mercy to heal, or to bless, or to feed, He now willingly stretches out to be riven by the iron Nail. The stream of Blood shews that it is done. He puts forth that other Hand, which could have "destroyed those murderers," patiently and meekly, to be nailed on that other Arm of the Cross, as One, embracing in His tender Mercy the whole world. He willed that His Two Feet, wherewith "He went about doing good, and healing all who were oppressed by the devil," should, in like way, be bored through. And so He is fastened, in the sight of men, and devils, and angels, to die the sinner's death, and by dying to bruise him by whom His heel was bruised, to redeem sinful man to endless life, and set him, cleansed with His own Blood, with the Holy Angels in His own everlasting joy. These Holy actions of His Atoning Death surely, one by one, concern us. We would not be of those of whom it is said, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" We would not speak of the Death of Christ, as an event only, by which our salvation was accomplished. We would behold it, as Psalmist, Prophet[7], or Evangelists have set it forth to us; we would gaze on, adore, and, by His Grace, love Him, in each particular Suffering which he underwent for us. Every pang of that Suffering must be of priceless value. Each has its own special mystery of love. We should kiss the hand of a human friend which had been torn in rescuing us. We should

[7] Ps. xxii.; Is. liii.

cherish human wounds borne for us. How much more must we reverence His Wounds, Who is God, and Who by them healed us everlastingly!

People could not speak, as some do, of devotions, pleading to Him, or to His Father, the Saviour's five Blessed Wounds, if they would go to Calvary. Devout minds, of every school, who meditate on the Passion, meet at least in this. Let any one gaze for a few minutes on that wide-opened Hand, trickling (in Scripture-words) with "the Blood of God!" let him think of the agonizing pain which it sent back to his Saviour's heart, and this borne for him! let him think how each several pain added to the pain of all besides, and was itself aggravated by all the pains, endured for him! let his eyes but rest upon each Suffering of that Divine Form, yet now scarce human, through suffering for us; and will he not, must he not, feel a fresh tide of love poured out from every part of that Frame, which is well-nigh one wound, and bruise, and sore, as he was himself, from head to foot, through sin?

It is, I believe, my Lord, the cold abstract way of speaking and thinking of the Redemption, *only* as an act consummated, an Atonement made, instead of beholding Jesus Himself, then looking on, pitying, loving, praying for, us sinners; Himself paying the price of our Redemption, Himself "bearing our sins in His own Body on the Tree," Himself healing us by His stripes—it is, I believe, this tacit substitution of the Redemption for the Redeemer, which makes this language appear to some so strange. They cannot have contemplated His livid Hands, the thorns pressed into His Brow, and His calm Eye resting in love upon His own: they cannot have beheld closely, and looked upon that torn Frame, and watched the Blood whereby we are cleansed, distil, drop by drop, from each several Wound, until the last gushed forth from His pierced Heart; and think it strange to beseech Him, in those Wounds to hide us, by that Blood to cleanse us.

Let me turn for a time from "the Paradise" to one, ever loved in the Church for his tender, fervent devotion

to our Lord. "In truth[8], where, for the infirm, is firm and safe rest, save in the Wounds of the Saviour? There I dwell the more securely, the more powerful He is to save. The world rageth; the body oppresseth; the devil waylayeth. I fall not. For I am founded on the firm Rock. I have sinned a great sin. The conscience will be troubled, but not shaken; for I will remember the Wounds of the Lord. For 'He was wounded for our transgressions.' What so unto death, as not to be loosed by the Death of Christ? If then this medicine, so powerful, so effectual, cometh to my mind, I can never more be terrified by the malignity of the disease."

"So, then, he was clearly in error who said, 'Mine iniquity is greater than I can bear.' Save that he was not of the members of Christ, nor, through the Merits of Christ, did it belong to him to claim as his own, to call his own, what is His, as the member doth what is the Head's. But as for me, what lacketh to me from myself I take fearlessly to me from the bowels of the Lord; for His mercies flow richly to me, nor lack there clefts through which they may flow forth. 'They pierced His Hands and His Feet,' and with the lance bored his Side; and through these clefts I may 'suck honey from the Rock, and oil from the flinty rock,' *i. e.* may 'taste and see that the Lord is gracious.' He counselled counsels of peace, and I knew it not. 'For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His Counsellor?' But the piercing nail was to me an unlocking key, that I might see the will of the Lord. Why should I not look through the clefts? The Nail proclaimeth, the Wound proclaimeth, that, of a truth, 'God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' The iron passed through His Soul, and approached His Heart, that it may not fail to know how to have a fellow-feeling with my infirmities. Wide open, through the cleft of the body, lies the secret of the Heart; wide open that great

[8] S. Bernard, in Cant. Serm. 61, § 3, sqq. Other striking passages from S. Bonaventura are given in the Preface to Surin, p. xxxiii.-vi.

Sacrament of loving-kindness; wide open the bowels of mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us. Why shall not the bowels be open through wounds? For wherein could it have been shown more clearly than in Thy Wounds, that Thou, Lord, art good and gracious, and of great mercy? For 'greater mercy hath no man, than that one lay down his life for' those sentenced and condemned to death.

"My merit, then, is the mercy of the Lord. I am not wholly bare of merit, so long as He is not of mercy. But if the mercies of the Lord are manifold, no less manifold am I in merit. For 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.' And if 'the mercies of the Lord are from everlasting to everlasting,' 'I,' too, 'will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever!' My own righteousness shall I? Lord, 'I will make mention of Thy Righteousness only!' For it is mine also; for Thou wert 'made to me Righteousness from God.' Shall I fear that one [Righteousness] shall not suffice both? 'The covering' is not 'too narrow,' that, according to the Prophet, it should not cover both. 'Thy Righteousness is an everlasting Righteousness.' What is longer than eternity? And this large and eternal Righteousness will largely cover alike Thee and me. In me 'it covers a multitude of sins;' but in Thee, O Lord, what, but the treasures of love, the riches of goodness? These are laid up for me in the cleft of the rock. What great abundance of Thy sweetness in them 'is hidden,' but 'to those who perish!' Wherefore, then, should 'what is holy be given to dogs,' or 'pearls to swine?' But 'to us God hath revealed through His Spirit,' yea, and through open clefts, hath brought us into the Holy place. In these, what multitude of sweetness, fulness of grace, perfection of virtues!

"I will betake me to those well-stored chambers, and, at the Prophet's warning, will 'leave the cities, and dwell in the rock.' I will be like a dove making its nest at the very mouth of the Cleft, that being, like Moses, placed in the Cleft of the Rock, I may find grace, when 'the Lord passeth by,' at least to 'behold His Hinder Parts.'

"Of [that soul] it is said, 'My Dove is in the Cleft of the Rock,' because, with its whole devotion, it is occupied with the Wounds of Christ, and by continual meditation, lingereth in them."

Why should not any in any sufferings find their consolations (as they have found them), where St. Bernard says,—in the Wounds and Sufferings of our Lord? Surely it is the most natural and deepest of all consolations, to dwell on them. No suffering can we know in any part of the whole frame, where He did not suffer, from His Sacred Thorn-crowned Head to His pierced Feet. This has given joy to suffering, by parching thirst or racking pain to have, as it were, a little shadow of His bodily Sufferings cast upon them, and to pray that our due sufferings might be sanctified by His, the Atoning and Meritorious Sufferings. "He willeth to be seen," says St. Bernard; "the gracious Captain willeth the countenance and eyes of the devoted soldier to be lifted to His Wounds, that He might thereby raise his mind, and by His example, make him stronger to endure. For he will not feel his own, while he shall gaze upon *His* Wounds. The martyr stands exulting and triumphing, although with his whole body rent. Where *then* is the martyr's soul? In safety, in the Rock, namely, in the Inward Part of Jesus, in His Wounds which are open to enter in. If he were in his own, he would feel the iron searching them, he would not bear the pain, he would give way and deny [Christ]. But now, dwelling in the Rock, what marvel if he become hard as the Rock? Nor is it marvellous if, absent from the body, he do not feel the pains of the body. So then from the Rock is the Martyr's strength."

And again, in plain words, "What[9] is so effectual to heal the wounds of conscience, and to cleanse the eye of the soul, as the diligent meditation on the Wounds of Christ?"

I cannot but think that they who object to Devotions in connexion with the Blessed Wounds of our Lord, as appealing too much to the feelings, take a very narrow view of human nature. Some of us

[9] S. Bernard in Cant. Serm. 62, § 7.

might think, perhaps, books of devotion which *they* use, couched in rather abstract and dry language. Why should we judge one another? All are not cast in the same mould. In some, intellect predominates; in others, feeling; in some, imagination. Intellect requires to be warmed; feelings, to be chastened; imagination to be restrained from a wasting luxuriance. But Bishop Taylor did not pray in the same language as Bishop Andrewes, nor Bishop Wilson like either. And yet each has trained many a soul to pray deeply and fervently. If any like not the luxuriance of Bishop Taylor, he is not bound to him; but why should he find fault? All food has not the same taste, nor does all suit every palate. Let us take with thanksgiving what suits us, thankful that the Bounteous Giver of all, bestows and scatters His gifts with such wide profusion, not despising others whose souls may prefer other parts of His rich pasture.

And yet these very devotions are strangely suited to win devout souls, who, with imperfect knowledge, yet love with a reverent kindled piety the Person of the Redeemer. While a school among us depreciates these, they will be prized by those who seem, on other points, most opposed to the teaching of the Church. Why should we not meet in our Saviour's wounded Side? In love for Him and His sacred Wounds, we might learn the more to love one another, and understand one another. "I cannot blame those devotions," said one, "for they are just what I use myself."

One of the most deservedly popular hymns, perhaps the very favourite, is one of this very sort:—

> "Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
> Let me hide myself in Thee;
> Let the water and the Blood,
> From Thy Side[1], a healing flood,
> Be of sin the double cure,—
> Save from wrath, and make me pure."

Very beautiful is it. But where is the difference between this very hymn and such as the following?—

[1] An older reading, I believe, is,
"From Thy riven Side which flowed."

" Open, Lord, Thy heart's deep cell,
Thou, Who know'st where mine doth dwell;—
There, from Thee ere Hell can tear me,
World, or flesh, or fiend ensnare me,
Shrine my heart, an offering free.
Panting for that Refuge blest,
Where this restless heart may rest,
Nought save JESUS would I know,
Nought desire of things below,
Nothing love, dear Lord, but Thee[2]."

What, I may say again, is the difference in principle, between the following beautiful and touching "Litany," and the hymn which follows, and two others which I will subjoin?—

LITANY.

" By Thy Birth, and early years,
By Thy human griefs and fears;
By Thy Fasting and distress
In the lonely wilderness;
By Thy victory in the hour
Of the subtle tempter's power;—
Jesus, look with pitying eye,
Hear our solemn litany.

" By the sympathy that wept
O'er the grave where Laz'rus slept;
By Thy bitter tears that flowed
Over Salem's lost abode;
By the troubled sigh that told
Treason lurk'd within Thy fold;—
Jesus, look with pitying eye,
Hear our solemn litany.

" By Thine hour of whelming fear;
By Thine agony of prayer;
By the purple robe of scorn;
By Thy Wounds, Thy crown of thorn[3],
Cross and Passion, Pangs and cries;
By Thy perfect Sacrifice;—
Jesus, look with pitying eye,
Hear our solemn litany.

[2] Paradise, § vi. p. 70.

[3] In another version,

" By Thy woe intensely great,
Agony and Bloody Sweat;
By Thy Robe and Crown of scorn.
Rudely offer'd, meekly worn."

" By Thy deep expiring groan;
By the seal'd sepulchral stone;
By Thy triumph o'er the grave;
By Thy power from death to save;—
Mighty God, ascended Lord,
To Thy throne in heaven restored,
Prince and Saviour, hear the cry
Of our solemn litany."

" Sweet the moments, rich in blessing,
Which before the Cross I spend,
Life, and health, and peace possessing,
From the sinner's dying Friend.
Here I'll sit, for ever viewing
Mercy's streams in streams of Blood:
Precious Drops, my soul bedewing,
Plead and claim my peace with God.

" Truly blessed is the station,
Low before His Cross to lie;
While I see Divine compassion
Floating in His languid Eye:
Here it is I find my heaven,
While upon the Cross I gaze.
Love I much? I've more forgiven;
I'm a miracle of grace.

" Love and grief my heart dividing,
With my tears His Feet I'll bathe,
Constant still in faith abiding,
Life deriving from His Death:
May I still enjoy this feeling,
In all need to Jesus go;
Prove His Wounds each day more healing,
And Himself more fully know!"

" Christ, of Saints and Angels Lord;
This world's Light, in Heaven adored,
Way and Truth and Life to all!
Peace and Health to every son,
Whom Thy dying Love hath won,
Man of Sorrows, Thee I call.

" Jesu, Prince of Life and Power,
Death's own Doom, Salvation's Tower,
Oh, with Thee Thy sharp Cross bearing,
And Thy bitter death-cup sharing,
Might I share Thy glory too!
Sin my trembling prayer would choke,
But that on that Cross I look,

And, at Thy stretch'd limbs scarce gazing,
Prostrate at the sight amazing,
At Thy Feet for mercy sue.

" These blest Feet, so bruised, so bent,
With these nail-pierced gashes rent,
Ere I clasp, with awe-struck gladness,
All aghast, in trancèd sadness,
Shrinks my spirit at the thought.
Lord! for this vast charity
Who shall duly thankful be?
Oh, the love ineffable,
Which, our ruin'd soul to heal,
Such a remedy hath wrought!

" Sweetest Jesu, God of Might,
Thou, my Portion Infinite:
Having Thee, what have I not?
Gaining worlds, what have I got,
Lord, without Thy love and power?
Oh, that in Thy furrow'd Feet,
Thine own Mercy's deep retreat,
When the day of wrath shall come,
I might run and find a home,
Shelter'd from that blasting hour!

" As before Thy Cross I lie
And Thy tender Feet embrace,
Jesu, Lord, hide not Thy Face,
Cast on me that gentle Eye,
Which on prostrate Mary shone.
Oh, that from Thy Cross on high
Thou wouldst turn that melting look
Which Thy fallen Peter strook,
Left him not to fall and die,
Bade him rise and weep alone!

" Thee, and on Thy Cross I seek,
Nor shall fail, if Thou shalt lead me;
By Thy Name, Blest Jesu, aid me,
To Thine Arms Thy servant take,
Breathless 'neath Thy wings protect.
By Thy sacred Feet I pray:
Fellow-heirs with Thee O guide us,
Through the desert walk beside us;
Wandering feet, that find no way,
In Thy paths of peace direct.

" Saviour, Whose all-pitying care
Loved to save, and yearn'd to spare,
Why thus hung with bleeding gashes,
Furrow'd o'er with harrowing lashes,
On the smarting Cross to die?

Lo, my Saviour's sacred Side,
That enwraps His Love's deep tide,
With the Blood and Water streaming,
With its melting brightness beaming
O'er these hearts so dark and dry!

" Lo, the Side that Thomas hail'd
Ere his doubting faith had fail'd
Lo, the open gate that leads
To my Saviour's peaceful meads,
Joyous gate to pastures green!
Here my breathless footsteps wending,
How, so oft, so sore offending,
Should I dare to lift my face,
Didst not Thou, the Fount of grace,
Draw me to these heights serene?

" Fount of sweetness, never cloying,
The fell serpent's bane destroying!
Ye that thirst, O, hither flying,
Drink of pleasures never dying,
Drink of Life's exhaustless well.
Crimson Wound, Thy depths reveal,
Make my heart Thy secrets feel;
How should other thirst enthral me,
What to earth again recall me,
Might I enter there and dwell?

" O how wondrous sweet to me,
Jesu, every taste of Thee!
With Thy wondrous goodness sated,
With Thy Love inebriated,
Souls would burst their fleshy chain.
Lo, Thy Side all gently clasping,
And with reverent fervour grasping,
Shielded close beneath Thy wing,
Here I'll brave the dragon's sting!
Here his fiery darts disdain.

" Hide me in this healing Cave;
Shroud me in this quiet grave;
Here shall all my sickness cease,
Here Thy servant rest in peace,
Here the foe's fierce malice flee.
Let me, Lord, in death's dark hour,
Free from sin's dread guilt and power,
To Thy Side for ever joined,
There with happy souls be shrined,
From the hunter hid in Thee."

The two first of these are, with the "Rock of Ages," the Good-Friday hymns in the hymn book used by the late Rev. Mr. Biddulph in St. James's Church, Bristol; the two last are entire hymns in the Paradise in contemplation of the Feet and pierced Side of our Lord when Crucified. What I would especially observe is, that the writer of the hymn, "Sweet the moments," must have written it, contemplating our Lord in the hour of the Crucifixion, as He was there, bleeding, dying for, beholding, us. Christ Crucified, must have been before his eyes, and he must have intended to set Him before the eyes of those who sang it to Him. Without piously beholding Him there, he could not have written that beautiful picture of Divine love in His willing weakness and Death—

> "While I see Divine compassion
> Floating in His languid Eye."

For, I think, that the very principle in question as to these hymns, is, whether persons may venture to picture in their souls our Lord's dying Sufferings. Such expressions as—

> "Precious Drops, my soul bedewing;"
> "Prove His Wounds, each day, more healing;"

or, in the Paradise,—

> "Hands, that made and fashioned us,
> And, when marred, remoulded thus!
> Jesu, for Thy gifts of might,
> Wounds of life, and streams of light,
> What shall Thy poor creature yield?
> In Thy cleansing Blood made Thine,
> Lo, I yield whate'er is mine:
> With Thy staff, sweet Jesu, tend me,
> With These fostering Hands defend me,
> And in every peril shield,"

are the natural expression of such contemplation.

Some will acknowledge the parallel, and condemn both alike. I believe that it is more according to the mind of Holy Scripture to acknowledge both. And I believe that it has been a deep evil of the coldness of the last unhappy century to abandon such fervent lan-

guage to Dissent, and not to acknowledge its use, because some unrefined minds have used it with a painful familiarity. They may not have had it enough impressed upon them, that He of Whom they spake, was in every action and suffering, Almighty God. We must, with this belief, not forbear from contemplating Him as God and Man, in every particular of the indignities, sufferings, weakness, which, in our human flesh, He took and underwent for our salvation.

I do not adduce this parallel, my Lord, for any such purpose as an argumentum ad hominem, or for any personal object. I do it for an end far nearer to me, at which I have ever aimed, to lay hold of whatever may show, that if the two sections in the Church could understand one another, they are not so severed as many on either side think. Many with imperfect belief, believe better than they think: their implicit belief is better than they can explicitly state; they dread receiving the full truth, lest it should involve the abandonment of what *is* truth, and which they have tasted and felt and known to be truth. They are mistaken in this; for the truth which they hold would but be deepened by that which they have not received. But on this very ground, (apart from the depth and fervent love of those devotions,) I regret to see them proscribed by some as though they were un-English. I do believe that these devotions might be very blessed among the poor; and that a more fervent devotion might take the place of hymns, which (although mingled with familiarity) the poor love, because they place them in direct relation to the Cross, and to the Person of their Redeemer dying for them. I have known the deep thankfulness of the simple sick poor, when they have been provided with some brief fervid ejaculation, and it has been suggested to them that they might, in their minds, contemplate their Redeemer on the Cross, and say it five times, beholding His Blessed Wounds, one by one, and ending with that last Wound, which opened His Side, and there gushed forth Water to cleanse, and Blood to redeem. No one who has not tried it, can know what this devotion is.

On all these grounds, I wish the prejudice against

these devotions removed, and therefore I venture to add others, founded upon the same principle, from a hymn-book compiled by the late Mr. Simeon, and very popular[4] among dissenters.

I take portions of hymns or verses, as they bear upon this point, excluding the Sacramental hymns, in which the expressions may have another meaning.

"'Here[5],' says the kind Redeeming Lord
(And shows His wounded Side);
'See here the spring of all your joys,
That open'd when I died.'"

"See[6] here an endless ocean flows
Of never-failing grace!
Behold a dying Saviour's veins
The sacred flood increase.

"It rises high and drowns the hills,
Has neither shore nor bound:
Now, if we search to find our sins,
Our sins can ne'er be found."

"Yea[7], more; I see my Lord,
Who bought me with His Blood:
I hear Him call me to embrace
A reconciled God:

"'Rise,' says the Saviour, 'rise!
Behold My wounded veins!
Here flows a sacred crimson flood,
To wash away thy stains.'"

"To[8] the blest Fountain of Thy Blood,
Teach us, O Lord, to fly;
There may we wash our spotted souls
From sins of deepest dye."

"Where[9] shall we sinners hide our heads?
Can rocks or mountains save?
Or shall we wrap us in the shades
Of midnight and the grave?

[4] I have before me the 21st edition, 1846.
[5] Hymn 46. [6] Ib. 47. [7] Ib. 48.
[8] Ib. 49. [9] Ib. 57.

"Is there no shelter from the eye
Of a revenging God?
Jesus, to Thy dear Wounds we fly;
Bedew us with Thy Blood.

"Those guardian-drops our souls secure,
And wash away our sin;
Eternal justice frowns no more,
And conscience smiles within.

"We bless that wondrous purple stream
That cleanses every stain:
Yet are our souls but half-redeem'd,
If sin, the tyrant, reign."

"On[1] Thee Alone my hope relies;
Beneath Thy Cross I fall,
My Lord, my Life, my Sacrifice,
My Saviour and my All."

"Ready[2] the loving Saviour stands,
And spreads for you His Bleeding Hands."

"Stretch'd[3] on the Cross the Saviour dies,
Hark! His expiring groans arise;
See from His Hands, His Feet, His Side,
Runs down the sacred crimson tide!

"But life attends the deathful sound,
And flows from ev'ry bleeding Wound;
The vital stream, how free it flows,
To save and cleanse His rebel foes!"

"Room[4] in the Saviour's bleeding Heart:
There love and pity meet;
Nor will He bid the soul depart
That trembles at His Feet."

"Open Thou the crystal Fountain,
Whence the healing streams do flow."

I do wish so much that this sort of devotion should not be proscribed, nor made another subject of division or censure, that, although your Lordship has no where alluded to it, I would set down a few more hymns from a hymn book of the Rev. E. Bickersteth.

The following is one of simple feeling.

[1] Hymn 62. [2] Ib. 71. [3] Ib. 92, [4] Ib. 236.

"Behold the Lamb of God, Who bore
Thy burdens on the Tree:
He died the Captives to restore,
His Blood was shed for thee.

"Look to Him till the sight endears
The Saviour to thy heart;
His pierced Feet bedew with tears,
Nor from His Cross depart."

THE FELLOWSHIP OF HIS SUFFERINGS.—Phil. iii. 10.

"Go to dark Gethsemane,
Ye that feel the tempter's power;
Your Redeemer's conflict see,
Watch with Him one bitter hour:
Turn not from His Griefs away:
Learn of Jesus Christ to pray.

"Follow to the judgment hall,
View the Lord of Life arraign'd.
Oh the wormwood and the gall!
Oh the pangs His Soul sustain'd!
Shun not suffering, shame, nor loss,
Learn of Him to bear the Cross.

"Calvary's mournful mountain climb;
There, *adoring at His Feet*,
Mark that miracle of time,
God's own sacrifice complete:
'It is finished!' hear the cry;
Learn of Jesus Christ to die."

THE CROSS OF OUR LORD.—Gal. vi. 14.

"1. How great the wonders of the Cross,
Where our Redeemer bled and died!
Its noblest life our spirit draws
From His deep Wounds and pierced Side.

"2. Let this world's joys be all forgot,
Its gain be loss in our esteem,
Christ and His love fill every thought,
And faith and hope be fix'd on Him."

Or the following, adopted from Dr. Watts:—

THE CROSS OF OUR LORD, &c.—Gal. vi. 14.

"1. When I survey the wondrous Cross,
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

"2. Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast,
Save in the Death of Christ my Lord;
All the vain things which charm me most,
I sacrifice them to His Blood.

"3. See from *His Head, His Hands, His Feet*,
Sorrow and love flow mingled down:
Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,
Or thorns compose so rich a crown?"

Let me close this subject with part of St. Augustine's address to virgins on the love of our Lord. "That[5] very thing, which in Him the proud mock at, gaze on, how fair it is! with inward eyes gaze on the wounds of Him hanging, the scars of Him rising again, the Blood of Him dying, the price of Him that believes, the gain of Him that redeems. Consider of how great value these are; weigh them in the scales of Charity; and whatever of love ye had to expend upon your marriages, pay back to Him. Let Him be fixed in your whole heart, Who for you was fixed upon the Cross."

There are two or three other points which it might be right to explain as to the use of these devotions.

I have already noticed how the number seven is especially used as a sacred number in Holy Scripture, and that there were actually seven occasions upon which His Precious Blood was shed. It has also been observed, of old, that "in that Divine Prayer (the Lord's Prayer) there are seven Prayers." Of old, too, deadly sins have been classed under the same number: — 1. Pride; 2. Covetousness; 3. Concupiscence; 4. Gluttony; 5. Anger; 6. Envy; 7. Spiritual Sloth. Now, why is our Christian liberty to be tied down, that, if any desire to pray our Lord by each of the seven sheddings of His Blood to forgive him all whereby under each of these sins he has offended Him, his brother should find fault with him? There is no difference in principle between the prayer of our Litany, which does plead to Himself three occasions of the shedding of His Blood, "By Thy Circumcision, by Thine Agony and Bloody Sweat, by Thy

[5] De Virgin. c. 54, pp. 351, 2. Oxf. Tr.

Precious Death," and such a prayer as the following:— "O most humble Lord and Master, Jesu Christ, Very God and Very Man, everlasting praise and thanksgiving be to Thee, for that in Thy tenderest age, on the 8th day of Thy mortal life, Thou vouchsafedst to shed Thy precious and innocent Blood for us, and be made, by painful circumcision, a true son of Abraham. By this most holy shedding of Thy Blood, I beg of Thee the grace of humility, against all pride and this world's vanity."

It would, probably, to those who have not seen the "Paradise," have conveyed more idea of those devotions, to speak of them (as in the Paradise, c. vi.) as "in memory of," or "in honour of," or "with reference to" "His Five Sacred Wounds," rather than "*to* His Five Wounds." The Devotions are (as Mr. Dodsworth has said) "Special Devotions *to* our Lord." They are thanksgivings to Him for those Wounds, or for those precious sheddings of His Blood; prayers to Him, by His love shewn in them, to give us grace and shield us from sin, resignation to His Will in all things, good or bad; "oblation of the Lord's Passion, and the five Wounds of our Saviour, to God the Father," praying, by virtue of them, for forgiveness and grace; but there are also prayers for "devotion and love towards them." And who, that even thought thereon, would not wish to love the Wounds of his Lord?

But the *prayers* are exclusively prayers to God the Father and to our Lord[6]. In the Hymns there are seven stanzas, consisting of Apostrophes to the Wounds themselves. I will cite the first of one hymn, as a specimen. No one can mistake that such an Apostrophe is in truth a prayer to our Lord, by His love as shewn in them.

"With the Blood of JESUS flowing,
Hail, blest Wound of Life and Grace.

[6] One set begins with the words, "Hail, Blessed Wound, &c." (as in the Hymn adopted in our Prayer Books from Dr. Doddridge, "Hail, sacred Feast which Jesus makes,") but the prayer is, "Guard me, O Lord."

Grant me, in all goodness growing,
Free from every sinful trace,
Lowly, true, with zeal deep-glowing
Aye to love the lowest place."

I would just advert, in explanation, to one other point: the Right Hand, is in Holy Scripture very often a symbol of God's favour, prosperity, blessing, eternal life; the left hand, (as "sinister" has this received meaning in our own language) stands for evil. I need mention only the Day of Judgment, the sheep and the goats. This will explain to some, what may probably at first seem arbitrary in some of these devotions.

Some have objected to some of these prayers on account of what they call the mystical character, or because they seem to them to have too much of sensible devotion. But I must again and again say, my Lord, "Why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" A false mysticism is contrary to the Faith. But these prayers are not such. There will be more danger of a false mysticism, if a vent is not provided for every true feeling. And surely, with hearts aching, as they often must in this troublesome world, with disappointments, infirmities, perplexities, bereavement, memory of sin, and all our varied anguish or agony, none need grudge that such a prayer as the following should be a source of rest to any one bowed down with the burden of his griefs? "O most Gracious Jesu, into that Wounded Heart of Thine, full of love, I resign my heart with all its attachments and affections: so steep it in Thy Divine love, and draw it unto Thee, that it depart not henceforth one tittle from Thy commandments. Amen."

There are some of a more fervent character yet. But it is not right in persons, nor true to characterise a whole book of devotion by a few prayers in it, nor to judge of prayers offhand, without using them, nor to measure every one by their own temperament. If I may again repeat what I wrote—

"Thou[7] hast here a Pa-

[7] Advertisement, p. xii.

dise, wherein many Christian souls have walked with great delight, and found rest, communing with their God. There are many voices in it, as doubtless in Paradise there was a sweet harmony of birds, soaring towards Heaven, and chanting their Maker's praise; divers flowers also, as well as fruit-trees, each having its own savour and fragrance and beauty, adapted to different tastes, or to the same at different times, each supplying somewhat of its own, and all by their variety answering the manifold wants and capacities of man. Do not then despise what thou findest good for thee, because thou mayest find near it what thou hast not yet learnt to value. Nor, again, force thyself to take what is not fitted for thee, or rather, for which thou art not yet fitted; but use thankfully and devoutly what He Who Alone can teach to pray, teacheth thee. Use not what is too high for thee, such as thou now art, nor what, because new, may seem strange to thee. Take that whereto He draws thee; use it not as something beautiful, 'pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make thee wise;' but as fruit from the tree of life for thy refreshment and growth, and its leaves for thy healing: and as thou usest it devotionally to Him, He will instruct thee how thou mayest best become, and do, what He would have thee."

VII. "By adopting language most powerfully expressive of our incorporation into Christ, as *e. g.*, 'our being inebriated by the Blood of our Lord,'"

In this statement, the words "our incorporation into Christ" are those of our homily [8]. "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but, as the Scripture saith, the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the Memory of Christ, the annunciation of His Death, yea, the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies in resurrection to immortality."

The other word "inebriated," is one which I learned (I may again say) before I was acquainted with any Roman writer, in the works to whose study I was directed by the Church of England, the fathers of the Church [9]. It is currently used in this way, not by St. Cyprian and St. Augustine only, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, or St. Athanasius, but by those who least employed imagery or dwelt upon the mystical meaning of Holy Scripture, Eusebius and Theodoret [1]. As this word

[8] On the Sacrament.

[9] This language occurs, as being employed in Holy Scripture, in St. Cyprian, Ep. 63 bis. St. Ambrose de Interp. David, &c. St. Jerome Ep. ad Sun. et Fretell.; in Hos. xiv. c. Jovin. l. i. St. Augustin, c. lit. Petil. ii. 47, &c. S. Zeno Serm. de Juda xii. Tract 4 (genuine). Vincentius, A.D. 480 (commonly Ruffinus), in Ps. xxiii. S. Paullinus, Ep. 9. Eusebius, Dem. Ev. i. 10. Origen, Hom. vii. in Levit. p. 222, ed. de la Rue, Tr. 35 in Matt. § 85. St. Cyril, Jerus. Cat. Myst. iv. Procopius in Is. lvii. p. 640 (quoting Jerem. xxv.). St. Greg. Nyss. in Cant. Hom. 10. St. Athanas. and Theodoret in Ps. xxiii. S. Cyril, Al. in Is. l. 1. Or. 5. p. 140. in Os. § 168, p. 195.

[1] Theodoret, interpreting Ps. xxiii. of the Holy Eucharist, says

might perhaps, more than any other, while brought out thus nakedly, cause offence, or even be a subject of ribaldry, it may be best to explain its meaning more fully. In this view, it may not be too long a digression to bring forward some part of what I wrote eight years ago on the figurative language of the Old Testament, to which I was led by the duties of my office.

"Thus then not only have things earthly a real correspondence to things spiritual; morning, night; sleeping, awakening; life, death; home, exile; but they all harmonize and bear upon each other, and so the more illustrate and establish the reality of their several meanings, and the mutual relation of each to each.

"To take another set of analogies. How strange, as bearing on the depths of the mystery of man's Redemption, that law of vegetable nature, inculcated by our Lord Himself, that life is through death! 'Verily[2], verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' And what light this in itself throws on many passages of the Old Testament! Thus Isaiah says, (iv. 2), 'In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the land excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel.' The language, the general character of the prophecy, and the use of the word צמח, 'Branch,' lead us to apply the passage to 'the Christ,' yet a difficulty has been raised how 'the fruit of the land,' which evidently is equivalent to צמח יי, 'the Branch of the Lord,' should apply to Him also or to a personal agent. Yet, if we consider that the 'branch' or 'off-shoot' is not a mere metaphor, passing almost, as among us it does, into a proper noun, but is a living symbol, there is nothing at all strange,

fearlessly, "This is plain to the initiated [Communicants,] and needs no interpretation. For they know that inebriation which strengtheneth and relaxeth not, and that mysterious Food which He setteth before us, Who is not only the Shepherd but the Bridegroom also;" and St. Athanasius briefly, "This is the joy of the Mysteries."

[2] St. Joh. xii. 24.

that, as Son of God, our Lord should be designated as 'the offspring of Jehovah,' but 'the Fruit of the earth,' as to His earthly descent, that Nature which He was to take of us, in order to give life by death. So, in a Psalm[3] which speaks of His Everlasting Kingdom of Peace, of the Judgment committed to the King's Son, His saving of the poor, His Heavenly descent like the dew upon the mown and parched grass, His lowliness is spoken of in the like terms. 'Be there a handful of corn in the earth on the top of the mountains, His fruit shall shake like Libanus, and out of the city shall they flourish, like the green herb of the earth,' *i. e.* on the most barren spot, the least seed shall become mighty as the cedars of Libanus, manifold as the green herb of the field, yet flourishing and expanding out of the City of God. It is our Lord's own parable, the grain of mustard-seed, which is again Himself. Again, in a Psalm which the Church selects for the Festival of our Lord's Nativity, 'Truth,' it is said, 'shall spring,' [shoot forth as a plant, תצמח] 'out of the earth, and Righteousness shall look down from Heaven.' Here we have again the same combination of Heaven and Earth to produce man's salvation, as in Isaiah (xlv. 8), 'Drop down ye heavens from above and let the clouds pour down Righteousness, let the earth open, and let them bring forth [as fruit, ויפרו] Salvation, and let Righteousness spring up together.' A Heavenly descent of Righteousness; the earth opens to receive It, and through both there issues from the earth, Salvation;—who other than He Who is the Branch of the Lord, the Root of David (Rev. v. 5), the Offshoot from the stem of Jesse (Isa. xi.), the Sucker out of a dry ground (Isa. liii.)? A Heavenly original, an earthly birth, that He might die for us. 'What[5] is Truth? The Son of God. What is earth? The flesh. Ask where Christ is born, and thou seest that Truth sprang out of the earth, This Truth which sprang of the earth, was before the earth, and by It were made Heaven and earth. But in order that

[3] Ps. lxxii.

[4] Ps. lxxxv. 11.

[5] S. Aug. ad loc.

Righteousness might look down from heaven, *i. e.*, that men might be justified by the Divine grace, Truth was born of the Virgin Mary, that to justify them, He might be able to offer a Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of the Passion, the Sacrifice of the Cross,—and how could He offer a sacrifice for our sins unless He died? How die, unless He took on Him flesh? How take flesh, unless Truth sprang out of the earth?' 'For the earth of human flesh,' says St. Leo [6], 'which had been cursed in the first offender, in this only birth of a blessed Virgin, yielded a shoot of blessedness, separate from the fault of its stock.'

"This corn-seed, which He sowed, was His own Body, His Flesh, which He took to offer as a Sacrifice, dying for us in It. And so it becomes the more impressive, as connected with the Holy Mysteries, how He elsewhere says, that He Himself is 'the Bread of Life, which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die;' that 'the Bread which I will give is My Flesh which I will give for the life of the world.' Our Lord, by using these images, points out the connexion. The seed-corn, which is His Flesh, gives life by its death; as bread, again, His Body, it nourishes to Life eternal; and that Body unites together the various grains to which it gave birth; 'for we [7], being many, are one bread, one body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread.' So again, this one image pourtrays to us the mysterious connexion between the Body of Christ, which is His Flesh, and the Body of Christ, which is the Church, and how, by partaking of that Body, we ourselves become what we partake of. 'Having said,' says

[6] Serm. 4, in Nat. Dom. c. 3, quoting both places, as do interpreters quoted by S. Jerome, l. 13 ad Is. init. "that they rain on the world the Righteous or Righteousness, and the earth open and bear (germinet) a Saviour." S. Cyril ad loc. l. iv. Or. ii. "One may say that Mercy and Righteousness springing or shooting forth from the earth is our Lord Himself Jesus Christ. For He was made to us of God the Father, Mercy and Righteousness.—But Christ brought not down to us from above or from heaven His flesh, but rather was born, according to the flesh, of a woman, which is one of the things upon the earth."

[7] 1 Cor. x. 17.

St. Chrysostom [8], 'the Communion of the Body, He sought again to express something nearer; 'For we, being many, are one bread, one body.' 'For why speak I of communion?' saith he; 'we are that self-same body.' For what is the bread? the Body of Christ: and what do they become who partake of it? the Body of Christ: not many bodies, but one body. For as the bread, consisting of many grains, is made one, so that the grains no where appear; they exist indeed, but their difference is not seen, by reason of their conjunction; so are we conjoined, both with each other and with Christ; there not being one Body for thee and another for thy neighbour to be nourished by, but the very same for all.'

"But what light does this reality of correspondence between the process in nature and the Gift of Grace cast on the sacramental character of the Old Testament! The very frequency of the mention of bread and wine as the chief gifts of God for 'gladdening [9] man's heart,' either by themselves, or together with that other symbolic gift, oil, prepares us to look for some meaning beyond our earthly nourishment. Why this food, and this alone, so selected, unless as a hidden prophecy of the Bread of Life everlasting? The lower sense is not, indeed, excluded by the higher; for the type containeth the original in itself, although in outline only, in that bread and wine and oil are gifts of God, and from Him derive their powers to strengthen and refresh. Yet this connexion teaches us how we ought in the type to recognize the original; take our daily bodily bread as the image of that 'Bread which endureth to everlasting life;' and, in the thanksgiving of the Psalms, thank God for 'that Bread' also 'which came down from Heaven.' This mystical meaning of 'bread' is further pointed out in the Psalms themselves, in that the Manna, whose spiritual character was so pointed out, is called 'An-

[8] Hom. 24. in 1 Cor. ad loc. p. 327, 328, Oxf. Tr.

[9] Of this joy, doubtless, that also is to be understood, "Eat thy Bread with joy, and drink thy Wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white, and let thy head lack no ointment."—Eccl. ix. 7. S. Jer. ad loc.

gels' *bread*,' the 'corn of heaven.' (Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25.) What a richness of meaning then do the Psalms shed around us, when we understand the 'Bread brought forth out of the earth' to be the 'grain of Corn' of which Himself spake [1], and 'the wine that gladdeneth man's heart, the oil which maketh his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart,' to be that highest strengthening and gladdening of the heart of man,—strength which abideth, joy when He seeth us again and our heart shall rejoice, and our joy no man taketh from us, and the oil of the Comforter which 'maketh the face' of the soul 'to shine [2].' And this meaning, when we see it, is the more literal too. For although to 'strengthen the heart' may, by a figure, mean to 'refresh and comfort the frame,' and is so used, yet most exactly, as well as fully, it bespeaks spiritual refreshment. 'He forceth us in a measure,' says St. Augustine [3], 'to understand of what Bread He speaketh. For that visible bread strengtheneth the stomach and belly; it is another Bread which strengtheneth the heart, because It is the Bread of the heart.' As, in another Psalm, amid the mention of 'the light of God's countenance' and the sleep in Him, it says, 'Thou hast put gladness in my heart from the time their corn, and wine, and oil increased;' in such a context, not surely mere earthly gifs, but, as has been said [4], 'Now do we abound with blessed fruits, which the Sacrament of the Church and the unity of peace minister to us as the image of everlasting fruits. For this Sacrament of our common hope is pointed out under the names of bodily and common things, which they who know [It] will understand.

[1] "What Bread? Christ." S. Aug. in loc.

[2] S. Cyril. Lect. 22. fin. p. 272. Oxf. Tr.

[3] Ad loc. See S. Ambr. de fide iii. 15. § 127. de Cain. i. 5. § 19 et al. S. Cyr. Al. in Os. 14. 7 et al. S. Jerome ad Ezek. l. 1. fin. "Nothing so strengtheneth the heart of him who eateth, as the Bread of Life, of which it is written, 'And bread strengtheneth man's heart.'" Add in Matt. xxvi. 26.

[4] S. Hilar. in Ps. cxxi. [cxxii.] 6. "Rogate quæ ad pacem sunt Jerusalem et abundantia diligentibus Te."

Of which abundance the same prophet speaketh in another Psalm. 'Thou hast put gladness in &c.' By this abundance of peace and of the Sacrament, is that blessed peace prepared for, and that unfailing and eternal abundance of heavenly goods.' So when Wisdom inviteth to her feast, 'Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled,' it is an anticipation of the parable of the Marriage-Feast, to which He, Who is the Wisdom of God, inviteth, not merely to the blessings of the Gospel generally, but to His Bread, the Bread which He giveth. 'What[5] more excellent than Christ, Who in the Feast of the Church both ministers and is ministered?' No other is the 'corn and wine' wherewith Isaac 'sustained' Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 37), and gave him therewith the blessing of Abraham. No other is 'the corn, wine, and oil' promised, when God should have mercy on her that had not obtained mercy (Hos. ii. 22, 23, and Joel ii. 19, 24, 26), or 'the corn and new wine,' whereby, when the King of the daughter of Zion should come, her 'young men and her maidens' should 'grow' (Zech. ix. 17, ינובב); no other the Bread of which the Psalm which delineates to us His Passion, and opens with His Cry on the Cross, and foretells that He should draw all men unto Him, tells us 'the[6] poor shall eat and be satisfied,' with which God shall 'satisfy the poor' of the Church[7], yea, 'rich and poor together;' as the same Psalm says, 'all the mighty of the earth have eaten and worshipped; before him bend all the dwellers of the dust, and no man hath quickened his own soul;' living and dead are alive in His sight and own His Kingdom; the living worship, those in the dust are bowed[8]; yet the living

[5] S. Ambr. de Cain i. 5. § 19. Add in Luc. l. vi. § 53. "The Heavenly Bread is the Word of God. Thence also that Wisdom which hath filled the all-holy altars with the food of the Divine Body and Blood, saith 'Come,' &c., &c."

[6] Ps. xxii. 26.

[7] Ps. cxxxii. 15. S. Aug. ad loc. "God Himself is the Bread. The Bread, that it might become infant nourishment, milk to us, came down to the earth and said, 'I am the living Bread.'"

[8] In this clause ברע is used (as Stier has observed ad loc. i. 254), which, (although not exclusively, as Ps. xcv. 6, where words ex-

live not of themselves, but by that Bread of which men 'eat, and worship' the Lord; of which 'they[9] who have eaten and been filled, confess the mercy of that immortal food, and worship as God, Him Who supplies it,' 'that Bread which He giveth for the life of the world, whereof a man shall eat and not die.' No other is 'the fat of the wheat' wherewith He feeds His people[1]; no other 'the wine[2]' which 'every one who thirsteth' is bid to buy and eat[3]; 'buy without money,' instead of 'that which is not bread,' or the wine whereof He drank in the garden of the Church, and biddeth, 'eat, oh friends, drink abundantly, oh beloved[4];'

pressive of worship are accumulated) occurs rather of "constrained obedience," Ps. lxxii. 9, Is. xlv. 23, which is so quoted Rom. xiv. 11; and referred to Phil. ii. 10, where unwilling submission of things under the earth is included, as it is here. ירדי עפר like יורדי בור (Is. xxxviii. 18. Ez. xxvi. 20. xxxi. 14. xxxii. 18. Ps. i. 12. Ps. xxviii. 1. xxx. 4. lxxxv. 5. cxliii. 7) is not merely "they that *go down* into the dust," but rather "they that *are gone* down," the actually dead, lit. "the descenders of the pit," *i. e.* those who have so descended.

[9] Theod. ad loc.

[1] Ps. lxxx. 16. S. Aug. ad. loc. "Ye know the 'fat of wheat,' wherewith many of His enemies who have lied unto Him, are fed." S. Jer. ad Is. lv. i. "which 'fat' signifieth no other than the mystical flesh," whence S. Cyril interprets, the LXX. στέαρ, ib. of the body of Christ.

[2] Is. lv. i. S. Ambr. de El. et jej. i. 10. init. S. Jer. et S. Cyril Al. ad loc. "For they who drink the living water, *i. e.* have been enriched with the grace of the Spirit through partaking of it, and have bought it by faith, shall partake also of the wine and wheat, *i. e.* the Holy Body and Blood of Christ." On the wine and milk, united also in Cant. v. 1, St. Ambrose so comments: "Thou shalt drink wine and milk, *i. e.* with brightness and sincerity, either because simplicity is pure, or because that grace is spotless, which is received for the remission of sins, or because He feeds little ones with the breasts of His consolations, that, weaned in joys, they may grow up to the fulness of perfect age." de Cain et Abel, i. 5. § 19.

[3] "Wondrous is it that they buy waters without money, and drink them not, but eat. For He is both the Water and the Bread which came down from Heaven." S. Jer. ad loc.

[4] Cant. v. 1. S. Jer. in Am. fin. "This is that wine of Sorec, whose wine we drink daily in the mysteries," in Os. xiv. 5, 6. "Or because our Lord Himself is our corn and wine, whoever believeth in Him is said to be inebriated." Theod. ad loc. "'Thy wine,' for this is the true Vine, whence this wine is produced." Add S. Amb. de myst. fin. S. Cyril in Os. xiv. 7.

that wine, which He would not drink until He should 'drink it new' in His Father's Kingdom; wherein we 'gather the myrrh[5]' of His Passion; wherein those who love Him with deepest devotion, who are His friends doing what He commandeth[6], are 'inebriated,' borne out of and above themselves; and He, without doubt, eateth and drinketh in us, Who saith that in us He is in prison[7]. And through this feeling of the reality of these emblems, the Ancient Church seems to have been guided by a sort of spiritual tact or discernment to recognize the blessings of the Sacrament wherever mention is made of the elements therein consecrated, and, where men are now wont to think of the mere element without the Gift, or of a spiritual gift without the element, to see both. And not only so, but receiving that Gift daily, their thoughts the more centred in what was their 'daily Bread.' Soul and body were daily nourished together; and so every expression which designates 'provision,' 'longing,' need, fulness, spoke to them of that Gift which they received daily in figure and in substance. And herein we must feel that there is reality and the most literal truth; for since the visible substances are indeed there, an interpretation which refers to the actual mystical table is more exact and full than one which sees only spiritual gifts generally, not to speak of that grovelling exposition which cannot rise above temporal gifts. Thus, when in the Communion Service, the Ancient Church[8] used the

[5] "There shalt thou 'gather the myrrh' of His Passion, *i.e.* the burial of Christ, that having been buried with Him by Baptism into death, as He arose from the dead, thou too mayest arise." S. Ambr. de Cain et Ab. i. 6. § 19. "I have gathered My myrrh, *i.e.* which I planted in thee; for I first underwent death for thee; so didst thou desire to die and be buried with Me, for thou wert buried with Me by Baptism into death, and mortifiedst thy members upon the earth."

[6] John xv. 14, in connexion with the parable of the Vine. "They are His Friends who are perfected, who keep His Image undefaced." Theod. ad loc.

[7] S. Ambr. de myst. fin.

[8] See also S. Cypr. Test. i. 22. S. Ambr. de myst. fin. de Virg. c. 16. § 99. S. Aug. in loc. and Ps. xcix. 8. Jul. Firm. Gaud. Brix. S. 2. Philastr. Hær. 83.

Psalm, 'O *taste* and see that the Lord is gracious,' she gave the fullest and most accurate meaning to the word טעם, and the mind feels a joy and delight, as having a new sense opened in it, and acknowledges that the word is thus the most exhausted and fulfilled, and all its meaning completed.

"In like way, the words 'My soul is athirst for God,' express not only a pining longing, whereby the soul is dried up for God's Presence, but the way in which He gives Himself; to 'hunger and thirst after Righteousness [9]' is further to desire His Body and Blood Who is 'our Righteousness.' The Lord 'hath prepared a table for me against them that trouble me' is 'that Table [1] which repelleth the snares of the Enemy,' 'that Table [2] where is the Living Bread, *i.e.*, the Word of God; where is the oil of sanctification, where is also the inebriating cup. Blessed inebriation of the Saving Cup!' that Cup, wherein 'the Lord is our portion [3].' All satisfying fulness is of Him and so speaks of Him. And so when God says, 'Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it,' He tells us how we shall be filled with Him, according to the measure of our capacities, Whose communication of Himself is bounded only by the narrowness of the vessels, which should receive Him. The 'oil stayeth' only when the vessel is full. 'Jesus,' says St. Ambrose [4], 'saith this to man; for Christ is fulness. He who filleth all things filleth thy mouth.' And since the Church and the Gifts therein are an image and the earnest and foretaste of Heaven, in her

[9] "This Bread of the inner man requireth hunger, whence He saith in another place, 'Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after Righteousness,' &c. But Righteousness to us, the Apostle Paul saith, is Christ, wherefore let him who hungereth for this Bread hunger after Righteousness, but that Righteousness which cometh down from Heaven, which God giveth, not which man maketh for himself." S. Aug. in Joh. 6. Tr. 26.

[1] S. Ambr. de interp. Dav. ii. 9. add de El. et jej. c. 10. § 35. Apol. Dav. c. 12. fin.

[2] S. Ambr. in Ps. xxxv. § 19.

[3] Ps. xvi. 6. "What is the Cup but His Passion?" Philastr. Hær. 44.

[4] In Ps. cxviii. § 17. § 9.

gifts too is that in its measure fulfilled, 'They shall be satisfied[5] out of the fulness of Thy house, and Thou shalt give them to drink of the river of Thy pleasures.' 'The house[6] is the Church; the fulness of the house, the exuberance of graces; the torrent of pleasure, the Holy Spirit.'

"And in this analogy of bodily and spiritual nourishment, even the specific character of each is retained. Strength and joy are severally the annexed qualities of our natural food, bread and wine; 'strengthening and refreshing' our Church selects as the chief gifts in our spiritual. And thus words, as 'inebriating,' or those of the like meaning, which sound strangely in our ears, who have, it is to be feared, so little of the joy of the Ancient Church, do declare the highest mystery of Christian joy. For man may be 'out of himself,' either by being above or below himself: and, in their highest degree, the outward semblance may, in either case, be the same.

"To the world, the Prophets seemed out of themselves from phrenzy[7]; St. Peter and the rest, to the multitude[8]; Hannah even to Eli, from strong drink. Of our Lord Himself it was said, 'He hath a devil, and is mad;' 'He is beside Himself.' St. Paul knew not even of himself, 'whether he were in the body, or out of the body.' Holy Scripture contrasts (as having, therefore, some points of resemblance) being 'drunken with wine' and being 'filled with the Spirit.' We speak of being 'intoxicated with joy,' 'with success,' 'with pride.' This is being out of a person's self in a spiritual way, though, in the latter, through an evil spirit. All are, in their several degrees, insensible, for the time, to the outer world; they cannot hear it, attend to it, see what others see. A trance is like sleep; those entranced are, so far, equally with one

[5] Ps. xxxvi. 8.

[6] S. Ambr. ad loc.

[7] 2 Kings ix. 11. משגע "maddened," *i.e.* "acted upon from within to madness."

[8] "There is another ebriety through the infusion of the Holy Spirit. They lastly who in the Acts spake in divers tongues seemed to the hearers full of new wine." S. Amb. in Ps. xxxv. 19.

overcome by wine, overpowered, insensible, as one dead; only the one is with the Angels, the other with the beasts that perish. In like way, common words, 'ecstacy,' 'transport,' imply that persons are carried out of themselves, and are, so far, 'not themselves,' which is, again, a term of the like kind. The Gift vouchsafed in the Holy Communion must be altogether of another kind, because it is not the stirring up of the human spirit, but the union of the Divine, the Presence of the Redeemer within the soul, when the soul is silent, not acting upon itself, but 'caught up,' present with its Lord, because 'one with Him,' penetrated with Him and His Divinity, when, in solemn words which have been used, the soul is 'transfigured' by His Holy Presence in it. Now corresponding to this mystery, it is strangely coincident that Holy Scripture should, in typical history or devotion, have used words, of which, from their very strength, we have been afraid, but which the Fathers understood of it. Thus, when Joseph's eleven brethren, the very number of the true Apostles, were admitted to feast with him whom they knew not, and he who was so eminent a type of our Lord, and was 'sent to preserve life,' distributed to them their portion, their joyousness is related in a word, at first sight startling, as most naturally and elsewhere denoting intoxication; 'they[9] drank and were inebriated [וישכרו] with him.' And on that very account, one must feel assured that it stands there with an object, and that the joy which they had in his presence to whose favour they had been restored, was, by God's purpose, conveyed by a word which should express a higher joy, when the Apostles 'were[1] filled with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they

[9] Gen. xliii. 34. E. V. "were merry" gives the spiritual meaning, taking the word not of largeness of drinking, but of joyousness. It is not said (as neither in Cant. v. 1) "they ate and drank with him," but "they *drank* and—." The bodily act of drinking had been already expressed. Hence it is more natural to take it of some mental condition, than as a repeated statement of the outward act.

[1] Hooker, v. 67. 4 ed. Keeble.

saw in themselves, and had a sea of comfort and joy to wade in.' And this, too, is, doubtless, a spiritual meaning of the vineyard which 'Noah planted, and whereof he drank[2].' After a type of Holy Baptism, there followed a type of the Holy Eucharist; as first 'the feet of Joseph's brethren were washed[3], and then were they satisfied with the bread and wine.' When, then, in the song of spiritual love, this same word is used in the same way, as something over and above ordinary drinking, 'drink and be inebriated, loving and beloved,' one cannot doubt that it, too, has its proper force, and that it designates some gift peculiar to those in Christ's Church, who share the myrrh of His Passion, and 'eat and drink at His Table in His Kingdom;' and that, in proportion to their love, so are they not refreshed only, but inebriated. And with this direct authority for the term in Holy Scripture, it is further remarkable how the Versions used by the Church have been, one must think, guided to express this quality, even when the Hebrew in itself implies only fulness, largeness of drinking. This, too, must have a spiritual meaning, since largeness of drinking, except of spiritual things, were itself excess. The meaning is the same, only the character of the highest spiritual joy has thereby been the more impressed upon the Church, and the word 'inebriated' became a received term. Thus when, in a Sacramental Psalm, there are mentioned together the table prepared by God, the hallowing oil, the overflowing Cup; the word[4] still expresses how the soul is immersed, flooded, inundated, drowned, so to speak, in the Divine love. It is

[2] "So doth the Cup of the Lord inebriate, as in Genesis, Noe drinking wine was inebriated." S. Cypr. Ep. 69. ad Cæcil. See S. Ambr. de Joseph. c. ii. init. S. Jer. ad Amos. c. 9. fin.

[3] S. Cyril Glaph. in Gen. l. vi. ad loc. p. 204.

[4] רוה. Comp. Ps. xlv. 11; Is. lv. 10, where it is used of abundant rain. Is. xxxiv. 5; Jer. xlxi. 10. "It (the sword) shall be inebriated with blood." In its Syriac use ܪܘܐ meant inebriated. It is used of intense love, Prov. v. 19; and in a bad sense, vii. 18; of drinking to the full in combination with satiety of food (שבע), Jer. xxxi. 25; Lam. iii. 15.

not merely the Cup which overfloweth, it is man who is overflowed; so that the ancient Version comes to the same result, 'Poculum meum inebrians.' 'For the imperfect,' says St. Ambrose[5], 'is the draught of milk, for the perfect the table of refreshment, of which he said, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me,' where is the Living Bread, *i. e.* The Word of God; where is the oil of sanctification, whereby the head of the righteous is made fat, and his inner sense is strengthened, — where also is the inebriating cup, whereby sins are washed away or effaced. Good is the ebriety of the saving Cup!' And so when it says, 'they shall drink largely of the fulness of Thy House, and Thou shalt make them drink of the river of Thy pleasures,' to drink what is Divine must needs transport a person above what is human; and the word expresses at once the abundant influx of the Divine graces into the soul[6], whereby it is no longer itself, and it pictures that state hereafter wherein the Saints shall be filled and overflowed with God. When again, in words immediately preceding a Sacramental Prophecy of Zechariah, already referred to, it is said, 'they shall drink, and make a joyful noise as through wine; they shall be filled like bowls, as the corner of the altar[7],' one cannot doubt, with what Altar that Wine is connected which is also Blood, whereby themselves also become an Altar, 'offering' the spiritual sacrifice of 'themselves[8], their souls, their bodies unto' God; and that transport of surpassing joy, wherewith the heart danceth and cannot contain itself, is again fitly expressed by the word 'inebriated[9].' And so even,

[5] In Ps. xxxv. § 19.

[6] See St. Ambrose quoted above. "Thereby he intendeth, not only the streams of Divine teaching, but also the participation of the mystical Food."—Theod. ad loc.

[7] Zech. ix. 15.

[8] Communion Service.

[9] המו. Comp. Prov. xxi. 1. "strong drink (המה) is raging," E. V.; of other evil tumult of mind, Prov, vii. 11. ix. 13; of spiritual love, Cant. v. 4. "My heart (המו עליו) sprang towards Him," or "was moved for Him," E. V. Vulg. inebriabantur. "In the Hebrew we read, 'drinking shall be inebriated as with wine,'

in remoter passages, where the Psalmist says, 'Thou visitest the earth and makest it to overflow[1], Thou greatly refreshest it, Thou preparest their corn, when so Thou preparest her' (to receive it), 'Thou makest her furrows to drink largely;' we may well say with St. Hilary[2], 'This earth which we employ is not enriched, but enricheth with the fulness of its fruits. The words then belong not to her which has no sense of being enriched and whose office is to enrich. God then visited the earth, *i. e.* the birth of the human race.' And St. Augustine[3], 'Whence did He inebriate the earth? Thy inebriating Cup, how excellent is it!' And this the more, since Holy Scripture speaks in like way, that the Eternal Word 'cometh down[4] like rain upon the mown grass,' that 'as[5] the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, so shall His Word be that goeth forth out of His Mouth;' in the words of St. Ambrose[6], 'When He hath, by Divine preaching, inebriated the veins of our earth, or soul and mind, He awakeneth earnestness for different virtues, and maketh to grow the fruits of faith and pure devotion, whence truly it is said to Him, 'Thou visitest the earth and inebriatest it;' for, by taking our flesh, He visited, that He might heal the sick; He inebriated with spiritual joy, that He might, by His pleasantness, soothe the harassed.'

"It belongs to the fulness only of conformity of things earthly with heavenly, that this Spiritual Wine, too, dispels man's anxiety, not to return more heavily, but removing it, and there succeedeth the joy of Heaven, which 'en-

so as to bear out that of the Song of Songs, 'Drink, my friends, and be inebriated.' And so will their inebriation be acceptable as the sacrifice of the altar, and as the horns or corners of the altar." S. Jer. ad loc.

[1] הִשְׁקֵה.

[2] ad loc. § 13. He adds, § 14, "We too have a food prepared.—That Food in Whom we are prepared for the participation of God, being by the Communion of the Holy Body to be placed hereafter in the communion of the holy body (the Church which shall see God)."

[3] ad loc. [4] Ps. lxxii. 6. [5] Isa. lv. 10, 11.

[6] In Ps. cxviii. lit. 13. § 24.

vieth not the Blessed Angels.' 'Because[7] the inebriation of the Cup and Blood of the Lord is not such as the inebriation of this world's wine, when the Holy Spirit said, in the Psalm, 'Thy inebriating Cup,' he added, 'how good is it; because, in truth, the Cup of the Lord so inebriates them that drink it as to make them sober, as to bring back their minds to spiritual wisdom, so that each should recover from this world's savour to the perception of God. And as, by that common wine, the mind is set free, and the soul relaxed, and all sadness laid aside, so when the Blood of the Lord and the saving Cup hath been drunk, the memory of the old man is laid aside, and forgotten is the former worldly conversation; and the sad and sorrowful breast which before was oppressed by the choking sense of sin, is now set free by the joy of Divine forgiveness.' 'Blessed inebriation,' says St. Ambrose[8], 'which infuseth joy, bringeth not confusion; blessed inebriation, which stablisheth the walk of the sober mind; blessed inebriation, which bedeweth with the gift of life eternal. Drink, then, that Cup whereof the Prophet speaks, 'Thy inebriating Cup, how excellent is it.' Drink Christ, because He is the Vine; drink Christ, because He is the Rock which poured out water; drink Christ, because He is the Fountain of Life; drink Christ, because He is the stream whose flowing gladdeneth the city of God; drink Christ, because He is peace; drink Christ, because out of His bowels shall flow rivers of living water; drink Christ, that thou mayest drink the Blood wherewith thou wert redeemed; drink Christ, that thou mayest drink His words; His word is the Old Testament, His word is the New Testament.

[7] S. Cypr. Ep. 65. ad Cæcil. § 9.

[8] In Ps. i. § 33. The immediate context is of Holy Scripture, but so the Fathers ever pass from the word to the Word. See further in Ps. cxviii. l. c. "Blessed inebriation, which maketh the mind in a way to go forth out of itself to things more excellent and joyous, that our mind, forgetting anxieties, may be gladdened with the wine of pleasantness. Excellent inebriation of the spiritual Table." Ib. in Ps. cxviii. lib. xxi. § 4. p. 1239. S. Hil. in Ps. lxiv. § 15. Theodoret in Ps. xxii. (xxiii.) 5.

Drink, then, speedily, that 'a great light' (Is. ix. 1, 2) may dawn upon thee, not an every-day light, not of the day, not the sun, not the moon, but that light which removeth the 'shadow of death!' 'The Psalmist,' says St. Augustine[9], 'sought a word whereby, through human things, he might express what he would say, and because he saw men immersing themselves in excessive drink, receive wine without measure, and lose their minds, he saw what he should say, because, when that ineffable joy shall be received, the human is in a manner lost, and becometh Divine, and is inebriated with the richness of the House of God.' 'Let[1] no one look to be inebriated, yea, let every one; Thy inebriating Cup, how excellent is it. We would not say, 'let no one be inebriated.' Be inebriated; but see well herewith. If the excellent Cup of the Lord inebrieteth you, that inebriation will be seen in your works, in the holy love of righteousness, in the alienation of your mind, but from things earthly to Heaven.'

"And so also there may be some intrinsic correspondence between the earthly and typical elements and the heavenly Gifts; earthly inebriation may have the same relation to heavenly, as earthly passion to heavenly love, man's anger to the Divine wrath; and the inebriating qualities of the earthly substance, to which ancient and modern heretics have objected, not only have their mystical meaning, but may have some mysterious propriety; and since this language is especially used of the gift of the Cup, it is to be feared that they, on the whole, suffer some very special loss, from whom is withheld 'Calix Tuus inebrians quam peroptimus.'"

Thus, this very expression, which has been cited by so many, as though I were unfaithful to the Church of England, is an expression uniformly used by the Fathers in reference to the Cup, which is given to all in the Church of England. It points to some special gift bestowed in the Cup. That there is such a special gift, is acknowledged by some eminent Roman Catholic writers, and is said to

[9] In Ps. xxxv. § 14.
[1] S. Aug. in Ps. ciii. Enarr. 3. § 13.

have been the opinion of all assembled at the Council of Trent, and to be tacitly implied by that very Council, however it may have been more frequently denied by more recent Roman Catholics.

Vazquez[2] and Lugo[3] (both of great reputation as Roman Catholic writers) both admit that it is the more probable opinion that there is some special gift in the Cup. Lugo says, that "Franc. Blanco, Archbishop of Compostella[4], who was present at the Council of Trent, said, that such was the unanimous opinion of the fathers [there], but that they were unwilling to define it inopportunely, lest an occasion of outcry should be given to the heretics; wherewith agree the words of the Council itself (Sess. 21, c. 3), where it is cautiously said, 'as pertains to the fruit, they are deprived of no grace necessary to salvation who receive one kind only.' It did not say absolutely 'no grace,' but 'no grace necessary to salvation,' where, not without reason, that expression appears to have been added, 'no grace necessary;'" and this, Vazquez adds, "on the ground that the command to communicate was fulfilled by the reception of one kind only." He notices also, that this Council, although it says "Christ, whole and entire, is received under one kind only," does not say that "the *entire* (integrum) sacrament," but "a *true* (verum) sacrament is received:" and he sums up this part by saying, "We grant that, according to this our opinion, the laity, to whom one kind is denied, are deprived of some grace, yet not necessary to salvation, and that this the Council did not mean to deny."

They cite, moreover, Clement VI. (A.D. 1341), who granted the Cup to a king of France, "ad majorem gratiæ augmentum," "to the greater increase of grace;" "therefore," adds Lugo, "because both kinds give more grace than one."

Lugo dwells upon our Lord's own words, in which He speaks not of His Flesh only, but of His Blood. "Christ said not, 'My Flesh

[2] In 3 disp. 215.

[3] De Sacr. Euch. Disp. 12. s. 3.

[4] Lugo says that he is spoken of, though not named, by Henriquez, de Euch. l. 8. c. 44, § 5, in marg.

is truly satisfying, or nourishment generally,' but 'is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed,' to indicate that to His Body, received under the form of bread, belonged those effects spiritually, which the natural bread worketh [naturally], as the Council of Florence said, in the Decree of Eugenius; and to the Blood, under the form of wine, belonged those effects spiritually, which natural wine worketh [naturally]; so then a certain effect corresponded to the Cup, *i. e.* to drink spiritually, which no wise belongs to the Bread; and, contrariwise, spiritual feeding no wise comes from the Cup but from the Bread."

Again, he urges, "It is not credible that the Apostles, when, after Supper, they were invited by Christ to drink the Cup, did not receive some fruit from that reception, but only a more explicit sign of the fruit which they had before already received; yea, from the very mode of giving the Cup, Christ seemeth to have invited them by some hope of spiritual fruit, and by the same hope to invite us, too, to the Cup, after receiving the Body."

He quotes also Arnoldus, Abbot of Bonneval (about A.D. 1162, a friend of St. Bernard), who, speaking of the Cup, says, "Christ Himself gave this Cup, and taught that we should not only be outwardly bedewed with His Blood, but that inwardly, too, the soul should be guarded by Its Almighty sprinkling; and that the power of so mighty a medicine, penetrating all things, should disperse whatever there was hard within, and renew and heal whatsoever disease clave to the flesh, or wherewith the corruption of the former life had stained the spirit."

He adds, "In this sense it is commonly said, that this Cup spiritually inebrateth him who receiveth it, which cannot be understood without some efficiency. In this sense, too, Christ is said to have given to the mournful the Cup of His Blood[5], *i. e.* to cause joy to them by that Drink, which also cannot take place without efficiency. Lastly, the Priest,

[5] In the hymn of Corpus Christi,

"Dedit fragilibus Corporis ferculum,
Dedit et tristibus Sanguinis poculum."

after receiving the Body, and before receiving the Cup, prays that the Blood which he wisheth to receive 'may preserve his soul unto everlasting life;' which, too, cannot take place unless it produce something in his soul."

And with the above distinction of the hymn, he notices, that Psalm cxiv. corresponds: that "bread strengtheneth the heart of man," "for that the effect of food is to 'strengthen the weak,' but that the effect of drink is to nourish indeed, since wine also serves to nourish, but by gladdening the sorrowful soul: 'and wine to gladden man's heart.'" "Hence, also, sometimes in Holy Scripture, the effect of the heavenly Cup is called, 'the inebriation of the soul,' because it brings a sort of gladness, whereby man is rendered in a manner insensible to toil and tribulation, as one inebriated is rendered naturally insensible."

I have quoted, on this point, Roman Catholic writers, because some modern controversialists among them treat any statement as to a loss through the privation of the Cup as though we thereby denied the Presence of our Lord. And yet there seems to be no alternative but, either to suppose that this gift of the Cup conveyed no additional grace to the Apostles (which Lugo thought so inconceivable), and to the whole Church during the thirteen or fourteen[6] centuries in which it was every where received, when it could be had; in other words, that its gift, when it was given, was unmeaning; or that loss is incurred by its being withheld now.

[6] Beveridge on Art. XXX. quotes writers to the middle of the 14th century, and Gabriel Biel later.

VIII. "By advocating counsels of perfection, and seeking to restore, with more or less fulness, the conventual or monastic life."

I am not aware that I have any where advocated what are technically called "the counsels of perfection;" and that, because I have not myself been called to them. Having, while God permitted it, been married, I have not advocated[7] celibacy; nor the renunciation of all worldly substance, since my very duties involve the possession of ample income; nor obedience, being under no ecclesiastical superior. I have rather taught, what God has in some degree taught me, to use self-denial in the possession of worldly substance, and to become poorer, if it may be, for Christ's sake.

I do not say this as implying that there are not "counsels" in the Gospel as well as "precepts." For our Lord Himself says, "All[8] men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given;" "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it;" leaving a choice therein, whereas there is no choice as to any command of God's. And St. Paul distinguishes on the same subject: "Concerning[9] virgins, I have no *commandment* of the Lord, yet I give my *judgment*, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." A "command" is set before all under pain of punishment. "Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor thieves, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." A "counsel" is that which is set forth freely, with the hope of greater reward. "It is matter of con-

[7] I do not mean that I have not been very thankful, when God has drawn others to desire, in this way, to serve Him "without distraction," and to "care for the things of the Lord" only; but such have learnt it from Holy Scripture, or teaching of the Church, not, as I know, from myself, except as far as it is notorious that I take in their plain sense the words of Holy Scripture, and accept the teaching of the Fathers.

[8] St. Matt. xix. 11, 12.

[9] 1 Cor. vii. 25.

demnation," says St. Augustine[1], "not to obey the Lord when He commands: but that which, within the kingdom of God itself, might be more largely possessed, if there were larger thoughts how they were to please God, will assuredly be less, when as this very thing is less thought of by necessity of marriage. Therefore, he says, 'Concerning virgins I have no command of the Lord.' For whosoever obeys not a command is guilty and liable for punishment. Wherefore, because it is not sin to marry a wife or to be married, (but, if it were a sin, it would be forbidden by a *command*,) on this account there is no *command* of the Lord concerning virgins. But since, after we have shunned or had forgiveness of sins, we must approach eternal life, wherein is a certain or more excellent glory to be assigned not unto all who shall live for ever, but unto certain there; in order to obtain which it is not enough to have been set free from sins, unless there be vowed unto him, Who setteth us free, something, which it is no matter of fault not to have vowed, but matter of praise to have vowed and performed; he saith, 'I give counsel, as having obtained mercy from God, that I should be faithful.' For neither ought I to grudge faithful counsel, who, not by my own merits, but by the mercy of God, am faithful."

The distinction, then, between "counsels" and "precepts" of the Gospel is given by our Lord Himself. I will not enter here into the question, whether, (as Dr. Hickes says that Fénélon explains the distinction) "counsels" become real "precepts" under the circumstances with respect to which they were given. One who is really and distinctly drawn by God to a more devoted life, as of holy orders, or a missionary, would certainly sin, if, through love of worldly ease, he held back from that drawing. What the consequence would be to him, God alone knows. The frame of mind which so draws back might end in the final love of the world rather than of God, and so in the loss of God.

Having now thought it right to speak on the subject, I would add, that St.

[1] De Virgin. § 14 (Shorter Treatises, p. 316, Oxf. Tr.)

Augustine and later spiritual writers, while they must say, that it is the higher course, where other duty permits, to give up "houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for His Name's sake," still give several cautions. 1. "Counsels" are not themselves an end, but means to help toward an end, removing what may be hindrances to the love of God. St. Augustine, certainly, without any hesitation, confesses, that the keeping of "counsels" is not the end of the spiritual life, but a mean or instrument to a spiritual end. He saith: "The[2] end of every commandment is charity, *i. e.* every commandment is referred to charity. Whatsoever things therefore God commands, whereof one is, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' and whatsoever things are not commanded, but by spiritual counsel advised, whereof is one, 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman,' are then done aright, when they are referred to the love of God, and of our neighbour for the sake of God, both in this world, and in that which is to come."

"Why[3] do we cast away temporal things? Lest they hold our steps in their way to God. Why things pleasing to the flesh? Lest they cloud the eye beholding God. Why tread under foot our wills? Lest they hinder the fulfilling of the Divine Will in them. Why do we abstain from wine and delicate food? That, subduing the flesh, we may feel spiritual sweetness. Why do we forgive injuries, not in heart only (as we are required), but also as to outward amends? That we may imitate Christ praying for his enemies.—These are our steps, these our essays, this our course whereon we run to imitate God, whereby we hasten to union with God; they are not that union itself, which perfects us in true virtue."

2. One who obeys diligently God's commands is to be preferred to one who is less diligent in these, while he follows those further counsels. "Not[4] only is the obedient to be preferred to the disobedient,

[2] Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Carit. § 32. (p. 157, Oxf. Tr.)
[3] Alvarez de Paz de Vit. Spirit. p. 463.
[4] S. Aug. de bono Conj. § 30.

but the married woman who is more obedient is to be preferred to the less obedient virgin."

3. The same is said of humility, the guardian of purity. "Virginity[5] is praiseworthy, but more necessary is humility. The one is counselled, the other commanded. To the one thou art invited, to the other compelled. Of the one it is said, 'He who can receive it, let him receive it;' of the other it is said, 'Unless one become like that little child, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' The one is rewarded, the other exacted. Lastly, thou canst be saved without virginity; without humility, thou canst not."

As the subject is not much spoken of, I may insert rather a long extract from Bishop Taylor, recognizing the principle:

"So[6] laws and counsels differ, as first and last, as beginning and perfection, as reward and punishment, as that which is simply necessary, and that which is highly advantageous: they differ not in their whole kind; for they are only the differing degrees of the same duty. He that does a counsel evangelical, does not do more than his duty, but does his duty better; he that does it in a less degree, shall have a less reward; but he shall not perish, if he does obey the just and prime or least measures of the law."

"There[7] are in the sermons of Christ some instances of duties, which although they are pursuances of laws and duty, yet in their own material, natural being, are not laws, but both in the degree implied, and in the instance expressed, are counsels evangelical; to which we are invited by great rewards, but not obliged to them under the proper penalties of the law. Such are making ourselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven, selling all, and giving it to the poor. The duties and laws here signified are chastity, charity, contempt of the world, zeal for the propagation of the Gospel: the virtues themselves are direct duties, and under laws and punishment; but that we be charitable to the degree

[5] S. Bernard Hom. sup. Missus est. § 5.
[6] Rule of Conscience, Book ii. c. 3. Rule 12. § 4.
[7] Ib. § 9, 10.

of giving all away, or that we act our chastity by a perpetual celibate, are not laws; but for the outward expression we are wholly at our liberty: and for the degree of the inward grace, we are to be still pressing forward toward it, we being obliged to do so by the nature of the thing, by the excellency of the reward, by the exhortations of the Gospel, by the example of good men, by our love to God, by our desires of happiness, and by the degrees of glory. Thus St. Paul took no wages of the Corinthian churches: it was an act of an excellent prudence and great charity, but it was not by the force of a general law; for no man else was bound to it, neither was he; for he did not do so to other churches; but he pursued two or three graces to excellent measures and degrees; he became exemplary to others, useful to that church, and did advantage the affairs of religion; and though possibly he might, and so may we, by some concurring circumstances, be pointed out to this very instance, and signification of his duty, yet this very instance, and all of the same nature, are counsels evangelical; that is, not imposed upon us by a law, and under a threatening, but left to our liberty, that we may express freely what we are necessarily obliged to do in the kind, and to pursue forwards to degrees of perfection."

"These, therefore, are the characteristic notes and measures to distinguish a counsel evangelical from the laws and commandments of Jesus Christ.

"1. Where there is no negative expressed or involved, there it cannot be a law; but it is a counsel evangelical. For in every law there is a degree of duty so necessary, that every thing less than it, is a direct act or state of sin: and therefore, if the law be affirmative, the negative is included, and is the sanction of the main duty. 'Honour thy father and mother,' that is a law: for the lowest step of the duty there enjoined is bound upon us by this negative, 'Thou shalt not curse thy father or mother,' or, 'Thou shalt not deny to give them maintenance, thou shalt not dishonour them, not slight, not undervalue, not reproach, not upbraid, not be rude or disobedient to them:' whenever such a negative is included, that is the indication of a law. But

in counsels evangelical, there is nothing but what is affirmative. There are some who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven: that is the intimation of a religious act or state: but the sanction of it is nothing that is negative, but this only: 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear;' and 'He that can receive it, let him receive it;' and 'He that hath power over his will, and hath so decreed in his heart, does well.' In commandments it is, 'He that does the duty, does well; he that does it not, does ill:' but in counsels it is, 'He that does not, may do well; but he that does, does better:' as St. Paul discourses in the question of marriage."

For myself, I believe that what I have written upon this subject, was in my letter to the Bishop of Oxford nearly twelve years ago. I will set down again what I wrote positively upon it.

"I own then, my Lord, I cannot read such passages as, 'There be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's sake:' 'he that is able to receive it, let him receive it:' 'Verily I say unto you, that there is no man who hath left father, or mother, or wife, or children, for My Name's sake, but he shall receive manifold more in the present life, and in the world to come life everlasting:' 'He that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart, that he will keep his virgin, doeth well; so then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better:'—I cannot read these and other passages without acknowledging that, though marriage is not permitted only, but 'honourable,' yea, our Lord honoured the marriage-rite by His Presence, and by His beginning of miracles, and has consecrated it into a mystery and an image of the Church's union with Him, still 'a more excellent way,' is pointed out to 'those to whom it is given.' Marriage has not only safety, but honour. Changed as its character is by the fall, in that it now gives birth to a tainted offspring, yet, that men might not despise it, and thence make a snare to themselves, God has restored it to a portion of the dignity which

it had from His institution in Paradise, dignified it in the Patriarchs, set forth an example of it in 'Abraham His friend,' and in the pure blessings of Isaac, made its mutual love a similitude of that which He bears to His Church, and of her reverence to Him, her Head and Saviour: hallowed it yet more, in that His Son was born of the seed of David, according to the flesh, though not after the flesh, and His Ever-Virgin Mother was betrothed, when He 'abhorred not the Virgin's womb;' and He appointed that mothers should be 'saved by the childbearing.' He takes us by the hand, and hallows our union by the blessing of His Church; so that what man might have feared to approach, is, when 'enterprised reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God,' a continual image and representation of things holy and Divine. But it is the very character of the Faith, that while it ennobles the use of God's permitted blessings, it points out to those who can receive it a higher way, by foregoing them. Thus, it declares 'every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving;' and it consecrates it to our use 'by the word of God and by prayer,' yet it shows 'a more excellent way' by fasting, which 'He Who seeth in secret shall reward openly:' it teaches that 'our lands are in our own power,' yet it promises 'manifold more to those who forsake houses and lands for His Name's sake and the Gospel's:' it teaches to 'lie down in peace and sleep in Him Who maketh us to dwell in safety,' yet those who are able, it invites to be like their Lord, and 'watch unto prayer,' to 'prevent the night's watches,' or even to 'spend the night in prayer to God:' it teaches to use this world without abusing it;' yet is St. Paul's example higher, who lived 'crucified with his Saviour to the world, and the world to him:' it sheds a grace and beauty around life's innocent enjoyments, and teaches us a Christian mirthfulness, yet it points, as the higher and nobler, to 'take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in *necessities*, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake[8],' in St.

[8] 2 Cor. xii. 10.

Paul's eight-fold 'perils;' 'in weariness and painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness[9]:' it invests with a sacred awe 'magistrates and those who are in authority,' yet bids those 'who would be chief among' us 'to be as the servants of all:' it sanctifies marriage, but it places above it those who forego wives for His sake Why should not celibacy be used by those to whom it is given, to bind men's affections the more firmly to their Lord? Scripture says, 'He[1] that is unmarried careth for the things that belong unto the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife.' Why then cut off the aspirings of those more ardent minds who hope thus to 'wait upon' their 'Lord without distraction?' Why not be thankful for our own blessings, without grudging to those who have foregone them for their Lord's sake, the blessing annexed to self-denial, that they might 'give themselves' the rather 'wholly to these things,' and to the service of their Lord? Why not content ourselves to be among those who have

'Love's supporting force
To cheat the toil and cheer the way,'

without envying others

'in their lonely course,
(Lonely, not forlorn[2])?'

"A more generous course, which would have interposed, when necessary, the guidance of authority, and led, but not inhibited, might have made Wesley and Whitfield useful members of the Church, instead of leaving them to plunge thousands into schism, and to train off into a delusive doctrine many of the best members of the Church.

"I am not advocating celibacy, my Lord, as the general rule of the Church, nor imposing upon others 'a yoke, which I touch not with one of my fingers:' nor have any of us so done. But surely there is room for all; and while the peaceful

[9] 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.
[1] 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.
[2] Christian Year. Feast of S. John the Evangelist.

duties of the country pastor can often be even better discharged, perhaps, by a married priest, 'ruling[3] well his own house, and having his children in subjection in all gravity,' a pattern of domestic charities, there are surely duties enough in the Church where celibacy may have its proper place, and where there is much room for the exhibition of the sterner grace of self-denial, foregoing all the highest earthly joys which cheer us on our pilgrimage, passing alone and isolated through the world, and *visibly* living only for his Master's work, and to gather in his Master's scattered sheep. If the degraded population of many of our great towns are to be recovered from the state of Heathenism in which they are sunk, it must be by such preaching of the Cross, wherein it shall be forced upon man's dull senses, that they who preach it have forsaken all, to take it up and bear it after their Lord. They must, like St. Paul, 'bear about in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus,' the prints of His Nails, and the piercing of His Side. The preacher of repentance did not go forth 'in soft clothing,' or 'living delicately,' or encompassed with the joys of life; and if we, as we much need, are to have men 'in the spirit and power of Elias, before the great and terrible day of the Lord,' the very circumstances of their lives must correspond with, and declare the earnestness of their message, and that they have left all to bear it. There is need and room for soldiers of all sorts in the Lord's 'willing army;' why cut off any one kind? why require that all His warriors should 'cumber themselves with the concerns of this life?' why should not some undertake a harder, so that it be, a 'willing service?' Why, again, should the daughters of our land be in a manner forced into marriage, and the days of the Old Testament be brought back upon us, and our maidens marry, in order to 'take away their reproach among men,' now that He Who was looked for is come, and they can serve Him, not by becoming mothers of the holy line whereof He was to be born, but by ministering to His mem-

[3] Marriage Service.

bers in a sanctified virgin estate? Why should we not also, instead of our desultory visiting societies, have our *Sœurs de la Charité*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their passport amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness, carrying that awe about them which even sin feels towards undefiledness, and impressing a healthful sense of shame upon guilt by their very presence? Why should marriage alone have its duties among the daughters of our great, and the single estate be condemned to an unwilling listlessness, or left to seek undirected, and unauthorized and unsanctified, ways of usefulness of its own?"

I did, and do, earnestly desire, my Lord, that these two objects should be realized amongst us; as, without them, I believe, that that cancer of our country, that waste of undying souls, the Heathenism of our great towns, can never be removed. To yourself, my Lord, the whole Church of England owes a deep debt, for the effort which you made, and to which you sacrificed, perhaps, what God will reward, health and strength, in doing what in you lay, to provide Houses of God for the poor of our Metropolis. But you must feel the more acutely what a mass remains, sheep scattered abroad, who have no shepherd, whom no man seeketh after. We need not single Clergy only, but bodies of Clergy, if the light of the Gospel is ever to penetrate the dark corners of our great towns, and in its streets and lanes, visit those abodes of festering wretchedness, where tens of thousands drag out a dying life to, (but for God's mercy not man's) an undying death, "without hope and without God in the world."

These cannot be reached by a few additional Clergy, here and there, nor would additional Churches alone gather them in to worship the God Whom they know not. Again, among our female poor, in educating religiously the children, orphans, or destitute, or worse than orphans, those with profligate parents and surrounded by profligacy, educated now for sin and Satan, and with Death for their shepherd; or in guarding that perilous age when those who are educated in national schools leave them, to be sucked in (unless care be taken which now can not)

in that foul black whirlpool, ever eddying around their parents' doors; or in recovering out of its sickening stream, those who haply may, from among that suffering mass, that they may, in true repentance, have their "filthy garments" taken from them, and be anew washed white in the Blood of the Lamb, to dwell with Him for ever; or in tending the destitute sick, or starving, coming among them, (as the poor, who have not known before what the love of Christ was, have called them,) "as Angels from another world," messengers of health to the body, and preparing their souls to receive gladly the message of the Gospel, and finally to "depart in peace," their dying beds soothed, gladdened, blessed in the love of Christ, taught not in words only but in deeds, by those who love Christ,—in these and other ways there is a special office for the ministering care of women, of whom our poet has said so beautifully—

> "When pain and anguish wring the brow,
> A ministering Angel thou."

Such are the needs ten thousand times ten thousand fold multiplied, in our metropolis. And, on the other side, there are those among the daughters of our educated classes, whose hearts God touches, who are unsatisfied with the nothingness in which their life wears away, who long to pass their days like those holy women whom St. Paul speaks of, who "laboured much in the Lord," who wish to gain the higher reward for more devoted service, whose hearts often prey upon themselves, because they have no adequate object for their being.

Your Lordship has declared yourself alive to these objects. And for myself, I may say, when some ardent minds have spoken to me of "the contemplative life," I have said, apart from other grounds, that the love of Christ did not now permit it to them; that amid this waste of souls, purchased by His Precious Blood, persons must seek to "perfect holiness in the fear of God, and to grow in the love of our Lord and Saviour Jesus

Christ" while "cherishing and showing forth love to Him in His poor and afflicted brethren." You, too, must think, my Lord, that what service any Christian woman can *do*, must depend upon what she *is*; that the more diligence any of us use as to our own souls, the more we may hope, by the grace of God, to benefit the souls of others. Mere benevolence will seldom hold out, nor has it the constraining power of the humble love of Christ. Him, and His love, we must set before us, as the beginning and end of all we do; our support, strength, stay, hope, and "exceeding great reward," if we would, through His grace, do Him real service, or benefit those for whom, with us, He died. But while I have longed for the growth in grace of any to whom our Lord has permitted me to minister, never, if I may speak of one sisterhood in your Lordship's diocese (if you alluded to this), never did the Christian women, united there for a work of love towards the destitute poor, female orphans, or distressed women, lose sight of those objects. Your Lordship, I am sure, would be thankful for what, in these five years, God has enabled them to do, in proportion to their strength, in works of love, for the bodies and souls of those to whom they had access. On one other point, to which your Lordship alludes, I may say, that it was a rule of that society to receive no one without the consent of parents, if surviving. Your Lordship will not think that rule likely to be infringed, when I say that I knew, at one time, of about a hundred persons, whom domestic duties, or the unwillingness or disapproval of parents alone, detained from giving themselves in this way to the service of our Lord in His poor.

I would now, in conclusion, put in my own words the sum of what, upon those various subjects, I have done or taught. And I may say that my own teaching has been throughout untechnical. I have sought to teach the truth in simple words, which would not be liable to be misunderstood through prejudice. And I believe that the impression made by that statement was not a little increased by the use of terms, which, if unexplained, the

English people would be very liable to misconstrue; but which, whenever I retained any of them, I explained.

I. I have, for some twelve or thirteen years, received all those who, by virtue of the direction in the Prayer Book, came to me, desiring to "open their griefs" for the benefit of Absolution. The greater part of these have been Priests or members of the University; but there have been others also, both of the most and the least educated classes, and in every profession. I have received their confessions, as they asked me, have instructed them, and, at their desire, as a ministerial act, pronounced their Absolution, in the words which the Church provides in the case of special confession. There have been cases, although but few, in which I have, from experience, seen that there was some special grief, weighing upon the mind, or some sin burdening it, and to those I have suggested, and, in two or three very special cases, urged, that confession was the remedy for them. I may add that they found it so. And I am aware of no regulation in the English Church which should hinder a priest, who thought that a mind was preyed upon by some secret evil, or weighed down by a hidden burden, from telling that person of a remedy provided for its removal. But, since I have had no parochial cure, these have been exceptional cases, two or three, perhaps, in the course of twelve years. For those who have spoken to me about their souls have most often come to me for the very purpose of using confession; and so I have, for the most part, been simply passive in receiving those, who, by virtue of the direction of the Church, came to me.

I believe, with the Homily, that "Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness," although not exclusively; and I have, with the Homily, called it, in a secondary sense, a Sacrament, although distinguishing it, as the Church of England does, from the "two great Sacraments which directly unite us with Christ."

II. I believe most entirely that our Lord Jesus Christ made upon the Cross "a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," and that

" there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." But as our Lord Himself in heaven unceasingly, in His Everlasting Priesthood, presents before the Father that Sacrifice, which He once offered upon the Cross, so, I believe, that " He has instituted and ordained Holy Mysteries," whereby the Church pleadeth as a suppliant the same Sacrifice, which He presenteth as High Priest efficaciously; and that so pleading It, she obtains, the rather from the mercy of God, the blessings she prays for, for herself or for her members.

III. I fully believe, and have anew adopted, every statement of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. I believe that the *Natural* Body of our Lord is in Heaven at the Right Hand of God, and that thence He will come at the end of the world to judge the quick and dead. But I believe that in the Holy Eucharist, spiritually, sacramentally, truly, and ineffably, we do, as the Book of Homilies speaks, " receive the Body and Blood of Christ, under the form of Bread and Wine." I believe also that since our Lord is present, not as confined, or contained, or circumscribed in place, yet present then, He is, as present, to be adored; as good Bishop Andrewes said, that " Christ truly present in the Eucharist, is also truly to be adored."

With this, my Lord, closes almost all which directly bears upon doctrine in this statement; and in all this, I have fully shewn above, (and I might have shown in much more fulness,) that the very same doctrines which I have taught, have been taught by approved Divines in our later English Church before me. Then what remains chiefly relates to practice. With regard to

IV. "The adaptation of Roman Catholic books," I have shown how this has been done in every period of our later English Church; and I have said, that my own sincere desire was to supply within our Church, and in conformity to her teaching and that of the Primitive Church, what God had, in other parts of the Western Church, taught those whom He had drawn to love Him deeply, either of practical wisdom, or knowledge of His word, or earnest devotion.

V. The "Rosaries," of which so much has been said, were simply "forms of devotion, addressed to the Holy Trinity or to our Lord, pleading to Him His own Life and Sufferings and Death." They were devotions which, mostly[5], could not be used with the "string of beads," which commonly, though not exclusively is known by the name of Rosary, and which is mostly, though not always, combined with devotions to the Blessed Virgin. And yet what a strange ground of offence it were, if any (in order the better to collect his thoughts, amid weariness of the brain, or dimness of mind, or any other infirmity of soul or body, which disabled him from praying collectedly,) were to use a mechanical help which, since we have bodies as well as souls, might aid him to fix his mind. I have directly, in all ways in which I could, endeavoured to lead persons to more earnest devotion to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and to this alone. Surely, if people would think, they would think it rather an act of spiritual tyranny to forbid a simple mechanical aid to fix the mind upon God. They must forget that distractions in prayer are so great a part of the trial of some minds, else they would not grudge them any mere outward help, which might, at times, aid them in it. Our end is to pray fervently, and with a fixed mind. Some pray best with a form before them, others altogether freely; others by using a deep form, as a sort of starting-point whence they may rise more readily to God. Others pray best, at one time in this way, at another in that. To some, variety is helpful; others find renewed depths in using always the same deep devotions. Why should we grudge one another, when we are all praying to the same Father, for the sake of His Blessed Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ?

I have maintained, in the abstract, that no representation of the Human Nature of our Blessed Lord was forbidden by the Second Commandment; nor do I know why any should not wear near their heart within a likeness of our Lord, as they would of a human friend. I never knew of any one, tempted to any worship of it. Those who blame me for

[5] See above, p. 78.

saying this, must first settle with themselves, how they excuse Dr. Arnold, who said far more than I.

VI. With regard to the devotions, in reference to the Five Wounds which our Blessed Lord received for us, they are, I believe, on the very principle of the deepest petition of our Litany. "By Thy Holy Nativity and Circumcision, By Thine Agony and Bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion." Those Wounds are the Wounds of Him, Who being Man was also God; they are the Wounds which the Prophet foretold that we too should gaze upon, and gazing on "they shall look on Him Whom they had pierced, and shall mourn for the sins whereby we pierced Him." They are Wounds which shall be beheld in the Day of Judgment, when they who persevered in piercing Him anew shall wail not in penitent sorrow, but in despair. "Behold He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him."

Why should we not gaze on them in thankful love now, that we may not behold them then in terror? But, on this subject also, I have shown that the most touching hymns, the most popular in the hymn-books of those who are most opposed to Tractarianism, whether among the Low Church or the Dissenters, are full of those allusions.

Why, when dwelling upon His Passion, should we not dwell on every circumstance in it, which the Holy Ghost has caused to be set down for us, and implore Him by every Deed of His Love to have mercy upon us?

VII. I have doubtless, often spoken of our being "incorporated into Christ," as do our Homilies, and as is the very characteristic blessing of the Gospel, that we are "members[6] of His flesh and of His bones."

To this none, of course, can object. That very strong word, "inebriate," used of the spiritual joy and forgetfulness of earthly cares and troubles in the Holy Eucharist, I have shown to be contained in the Canticles, to be in harmony with other passages in Holy Scripture, to be used even by those fathers who least use a mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture. I am reminded,

[6] Eph. v. 30.

while writing this, that it was adopted in our later Church by one whom those who censure me will respect, Abp. Cranmer, just before the close of his life.

"Consider[7] My Body, for you nailed to the Cross. Feed eagerly (devorate) on this in your minds; be sated with My Death. This is the true Meat; this the inebriating Drink, wherewith truly satisfied and inebriated ye shall live for ever."

But I would say that I would not use, as I have not used, that word popularly, because it would seem strange, and would be wholly unintelligible to minds, which had never seen it explained. I retained it only in forms of very deep devotion, in my adapted books, which would, I thought, be used only by minds which would use it very reverently.

VIII. I have not (as far as I am aware) technically spoken of "counsels of perfection." What I have chiefly spoken of, has been the duty of self-denial, both for our own sakes, and for Christ's poor. I have, again and again, preached against the neglect of the poor, the waste of souls, which the rich, amid their luxury and ease, care not for; and I have spoken of the blessedness of ministering to them, in any way in which any can. Yet there can be no question, that our Lord Himself speaks of a higher devotion to His service, "which all cannot receive, but they to whom it is given." There are measures of service, to which some, not all, are called. Our Ordination service requires an inward, as well as an outward call, through which persons are "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost." Again, it is a high call to be a Missionary; or, again, to live for the love of Christ Alone and His poor, as "sisters of mercy." Our Lord has pronounced those blessed, who forsake what they lawfully may, "for His sake and the Gospel's," and I have done little more than bid those whom He seemed so to have called, to "be of good courage," and to pray to Him for perseverance. Surely none will blame the echoing of our Lord's own words.

[7] Cranmer's Answer to the three Articles given him by the Committee at Oxford. Works, Vol. iv. p. 19. ed. Jenkyns.

And now, my Lord, having closed this long explanation, may I be allowed to say a few words, more generally, about myself, since I observe, or have heard, that my motives and objects have been much mistaken or misrepresented by those who know me not in our own Church, by Dissenters, who, in the late meetings, have spoken very bitterly, and by some among those who have left us.

Whatever my sins, or failures, or shortcomings have been, one object I had ever before me, from my earliest memory, to serve God in the ministry of this His Church. As years grew on, and (at the desire of one then in office in the Church to whom I owe a great debt for his fatherly love, and theological training) I became acquainted with German theology, I expected that a chief point of attack from Rationalism would be through the Old Testament, and on that ground I devoted myself for some time to all those studies which bear upon Hebrew, having nothing less in my thoughts, and wishing for nothing less, and dreading, when it was named to me, the post which I have since occupied. And, since that time, my object has been simply to do, (as occasions arose or seemed to indicate,) whatever God gave me to do in this portion of His Church.

I never essayed (as some have said of late) to be a leader of a party, nor to organize a body, nor to act upon a system, nor to direct things or persons to any given end, except the end of all ends, holiness and truth in the fear and love of God. I never sought (it seems to myself strange to have to deny this) to gather persons around me. When I acted, I acted, rather following advice, than giving it. Only on some few great occasions, and those such as called upon others to act, and that chiefly within this University, and concerning it, have I *acted* in combination with others; and in these cases I was no otherwise prominent, than the station which had been assigned to me necessarily involved.

Until the judicial decision of the Privy Council forced upon the Church the necessity of declaring her own faith for herself, I ever deprecated the meeting of Convocation, not wishing (as one before me expressed

himself) that any thing should be decided by mere majorities. My longing and earnest desire was that those with imperfect knowledge should be drawn to the full knowledge of the truth, not that they should be removed. And when, through that unhappy decision of the Privy Council, Churchmen were compelled to take a decided line, and, since your Lordships declined to speak in the name of the Church, to ask that the Church herself should meet and declare what her mind is on this article of faith, my own desire was to aid those who believed the truth, but were kept asunder by mutual misunderstandings, to come to an understanding among themselves. Until the State began aggressions upon the Church, Churchmen (and myself among them) were thankful to do what God gave us to do in peace. Even sheep and deer will close their ranks together in defence. We longed to be at peace, until we dared not. Church Unions were but the convulsive efforts of a sound system to throw out a disease whereby the ordinary functions were hindered. For myself, I took no part in them, nor, on any occasion, save one, for many years, acted with others out of the University, until the faith of the Church was impugned under the form of law. On that one occasion many of your Lordships also acted together, on a sudden emergency.

My name (I have once before said) was on no other ground used in the first instance as a sort of by-word, than because, in order to save a pupil from dissent, and then, to show how deeply the truth lay in Holy Scriptures, I engaged in the work on the Scriptural Doctrine of Holy Baptism, which grew as I went on, until it became a work instead of a tract. The name became a convenient brand-mark with which to designate principles or truths which those dislike who do not know the truth. Bishops do not escape it, if they defend that vital doctrine and article of faith, which your Lordship has recently elaborately vindicated. Only lately, in an article in a leading dissenting paper, the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration was placed as the first of three doctrines, selected as containing the essence and of-

fence of the system designated by my name.

Another, a Socinian writer, puts together as "merely the grosser forms of the admixture of popery, which has entered into and spoiled all the institutions of the Reformed Churches,"—"*Baptismal regeneration*, the real presence in the Eucharist, Mariolatry, the honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the Cross, the turning of his back on the people by the priest, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution."

A third, a Peer who a few years past forsook the Church and became a dissenter, designated as three chief offences of the Church, her belief in Baptismal regeneration, in the gift of the Holy Ghost in Ordination, and in the principle of confession and absolution. On all these three points, he says, that "the Tractarians" are "most in conformity with the Liturgy." I will set down two passages, not of course, adopting his language, and hoping that he does injustice to the faith of many of the Evangelicals, as he certainly does to those whom, in distinction to "the Tractarians," he calls High Church. What I cite him for, is that he makes the belief in these doctrines, for which my name is made a by-word, to be the chief offence of the Tractarians, yet to be in conformity with the Liturgy.

"Taking[8] our Liturgy into consideration, there is no doubt but that the Tractarian creed is more in accordance with its offices, than that of the Evangelical or High Church clergy." . . "I will now shortly recapitulate the doctrine set forth in the different services of our Liturgy. In the first place comes the doctrine of spiritual regeneration contained in the Catechism and Baptismal Service, and confirmed in that for the Burial of the Dead. Next comes the declaration that the priests and bishops are the depositories of the Holy Ghost; and immediately after, it is asserted, that they have the power of both forgiving and retaining sins. Lastly, in the Order for Visiting the Sick is contained the principle of confession and absolution. Which, then, of the three,

[8] Revise the Liturgy, by a Peer, p. 6. 10.

the Tractarian, the High Churchman, or the Evangelical minister appears most in conformity with the Liturgy? The Tractarian accepts all these doctrines; the High Churchman none of them, except perhaps a small and undefinable fractional part of baptismal regeneration; the Evangelical minister rejects them all. Surely then, as far as the Liturgy is concerned, the Tractarian is the most correct in his creed."

I mention this, my Lord, in illustration, that my name came to be thus publicly used, only because, in the "Tracts for the Times," I maintained a main article of faith. My contributions to that series were on Fasting, Baptism, and the Commemorative Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist. What I have wished in all that I have done, was not to act upon the Church, but to teach individuals what I had learned of and in her; not (as some have said) to raise her to something which she was not, but to raise her children to the doctrine and practice which she teaches.

The work which I myself especially planned, "the Library of the Fathers," was entered upon amid the advice of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and with his concurrence and sanction, as well as that of most of the Bishops. Its main object was to provide for the children of our Church a great body of Catholic teaching from the very writers to whom she appeals so often, and with so much reverence, in the homilies, and to which her Canon of 1571 more especially directs our study, after the Holy Scriptures. "They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and *collected out of that very Doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.*" In the event, nearly three-fourths of the Library has consisted of comments upon Holy Scripture.

Another common object I had, which these evil times have prevented, a Commentary on Holy Scripture, which should embody and recast in one, what devout minds had in different ages learnt through reverent meditation upon God's word. For I do think that our

manifold controversies have drawn many of us far too much from the reverent study of the Word of God. My other plan, my adapted books, had still the same object of building up the children of our Church within her, and if I could tell your Lordship of the thanks which I have received from those who have been so built up, and abide in rest and peace, within the bosom of our Church, and have grown in the love of our Lord, and conformity to His holy will, it would mitigate, I am sure, your Lordship's disapprobation of the plan. Your Lordship, I am satisfied, does not allude to myself when you speak of Clergymen who put into the hands of members of our Church "books of devotion in which all but Divine honour is paid to the Virgin Mary," because, as I have said above, I have carefully on principle avoided it, both for myself and others.

If, in these last times of dreariness and perplexity, the minds of many have turned towards myself, this has not been my doing. In whatever degree I have been a guide to others, it has been that, having no parochial cure, I have been able in some measure to give advice to those who applied to me. Your Lordship, I am sure, would not have a minister of Christ refuse such help as he could give, when asked in Christ's Name.

Since I have not, except in some few very special cases, *recommended* individuals to use confession, I need hardly say that I have not recommended persons to place themselves under what is commonly understood by the technical word "direction." The "guidance" which I have myself mostly given to those who came to me, has been such instruction as my experience enabled me to give, how they might conquer in detail their besetting sins, or in any way, to grow in the love of God. The use of a spiritual guide (which Bishop Taylor also recommends) does not (as people dream) interfere with the charities or relations of domestic life, nor does it involve the knowledge of the secrets of families. It is an acknowledged rule in confession to avoid speaking of or naming the sins of others, or in any way making known their sins or infir-

mities. The change which is wrought by God's grace, and towards which one more experienced in the Christian life, aids, under that grace, is not so much in the outward form of life, as in the soul within. The change is seen, not so much in outward acts, as in the temper of mind in which they are done. Domestic charities are fostered, not impaired. The priest comes not between the parent and the child, God forbid: he but aids the child or the parent (as it may be) to conquer the yet unsubdued tempers which chill parental or filial love. The grown-up son or daughter is changed only in that they become more loving, respectful, and obedient; brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, live in greater unity and love. Spiritual advice, as a rule, relates to inward right conduct in the ordinary duties of life, not to the outward circumstances of domestic life. The object of any spiritual guide, is to teach persons to guide themselves, to give them right principles of action, which they may on different occasions apply; to strengthen them where they are weak, to enable them to walk freely, not himself to be a mere crutch, unless it were needed to support real weakness. And what parent would not do this if he could, or desire that, when needed, it should be done by the help of God?

About the future history of our Church, I have felt the less anxious, because I felt, as your Lordship too feels, and has expressed, that God's Good Hand was with her. I have never planned any thing, as some have at all times planned, nor worked (as some would wish) directly for her reunion with the rest of Christendom, because I always felt that a healthful restoration of unity must be God's doing, in His time and way; to be prayed for, not planned. I have said so to others, who seemed to be impatient for this, and to aim at what was impossible. I have ever hoped that the Church of England, whom God has, by His Providence, and in its history, so marvellously distinguished from the Protestant bodies on the Continent or among the dissenters, had a special destiny and office in store for her, in His All-merciful designs. And in this great restoration of our Church, when younger men have seemed to me to turn their

eyes too narrowly to one portion of God's work, I have both publicly and privately pointed out what has been so impressed upon myself, how that work embraces every part and section of the Church.

And with regard to these unhappy secessions from our Church, which persons are now, in all directions, ascribing to certain teaching and practices, I may venture, on a sorrowful and intimate knowledge of them, to say that nothing was ever less true. The two leading causes, as may be seen from the very statements of those who have left us, have been, —(1) that the Scriptural doctrine of the Unity of the Church did not seem to them to be satisfied by the English belief, that the Church was still one, notwithstanding its distractions and interruption of Communion, or, as it has been said, that "a family may still be one, though its members quarrel;" (2) that since the teachers of our Church seem to be at issue among themselves upon articles of faith, our Church does not perform the office promised, "thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers."

These, it must be admitted, my Lord, are difficulties, to which there are counter-difficulties, which may well make us not patient only, but grateful to God for His goodness. I mean, that although there is still enough (as I have often inculcated) in the unity of that Faith which was delivered from the first, in the common Sacraments, in common Apostolic descent, in union in our One Lord, in common prayer, and, I trust, notwithstanding appearances on both sides, in love, we must admit that Unity is not such as it was in St. Augustine's time. Rome gives an adequate theory of unity, although to that hard theory she sacrifices a great portion of the Church, which "throughout all the world acknowledges" the One Lord of the Church. Again, we must admit, all upon all sides cry out, that there should not be this conflicting teaching. While some of us are anxious to come to a better understanding with one another, others are anxious to cast out those who differ from them. The great outcry which is ringing through our great towns (although in great degree arising from those external to the Church), yet, as far as

it comes from Churchmen, is an acknowledgment that the state of things is not right, that there ought not to be so many various voices. Multitudes will, I trust, abide patiently, trusting that when this Babel-cry is past, the Church will be allowed, in peace within and without, and seeking the peace of her children, to bring them to a right understanding with one another. But now, it does press hardly upon some who would serve the Church devotedly, whether this clamour be not perhaps the voice of the Church, whether both parties who speak against one another, do really at all misunderstand one another, or whether they can ever be brought to understand one another in the one truth.

These last disquietudes have been very much aggravated by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It was urged, last year, upon several of your Lordship's brethren, with deep anxiety and tears and prayers, that unless some measure were adopted, which would assure persons that the Church of England did not abandon the article of the faith which the Judicial Committee had impugned, the Church would lose many members whom she could ill spare, and who clung to her. Those who so urged this, did not desire to eject others; they wished that things should be restored as they were before, or, if any more positive declaration were made, they wished it to be accompanied with such explanations as should exclude those only who, understanding the doctrine which the Church affirms, rejected it. Those who have left us since, are but a portion of those whose loss was feared, and who, some of our Bishops were warned, would be lost to the Church if nothing was done.

I believe that the reading of Roman controversy by persons unqualified to engage in it has had far, very far, more effect than the use of books, even of *un*adapted Roman devotions, which is also very extensive, and for which I am in no way responsible. Dr. Nicholls in 1700 spoke of the extent to which they were then used, and their effect in withdrawing persons from us. But, more than this, the press swarms with controversy. It is circulated diligently. In a cheap form it finds its way every where. I doubt much whether any instance could be found of any one indivi-

dual who has really (if the truth were known) been led on by those who remain in the English Church, so as to leave her. Some may have attributed their change to teaching which they received in the English Church. But I *know* that some have thanked their English teachers for the exchange, when those who know them well, *know* that it proceeded from other causes.

I will not say again, that there has not been, and is not, much fretful and undutiful language as to the Church of England; that persons have not reflected and repeated each other's discontents and discontented language, until, like burning glasses, they increased it; that there has not been much impatient treatment of the Articles, wilfully or recklessly interpreting them unfavourably; that persons have not been over-sensitive to ills around them, so that if they judged of the Gospel with the same measure with which they have ventured to judge of their Church, they would have become infidels, as, from a like temper, persons in the Roman Church have often lapsed into infidelity,

But all this has nothing to do with any sort of teaching. And it is worse than idle to talk, as some have done, of putting down "Tractarianism," in order to check secessions to Rome. Such might drive hundreds from the Church for tens; but while that precious jewel, the Prayer Book remains, they cannot destroy or weaken "Tractarianism." It was out of Holy Scripture and the Formularies of the Church that Tractarianism arose. It was cherished by our English Divines. It was deepened by the Fathers. It was ripened while most of the writers knew scarcely a Roman book, and only controversially. Tractarianism was entirely the birth of the English Church. Its life must be co-existent with the formularies in which it is embodied. Tractarianism was not beheaded with Laud, nor trampled under foot in the Great Rebellion, nor corrupted by Charles II., nor expelled with the Nonjurors, nor burnt, together with the Common Prayer Book, in Scotland, nor extinguished by the degradation of the Church through Walpole, nor in America by the long-denied Episcopate. Even the pared and maimed Prayer Book of the Church in the United States still affords it a home; and the

sameness of the struggles implies the same principle of life. Tractarianism, as it is called, or, as I believe it to be, the Catholic Faith, will survive in the Church of England while the Scriptures are reverenced, and the Œcumenical Councils received, and the Creeds recited, and the Episcopal succession continues, and union with Christ her Head is cherished, and she acquiesce not, God forbid! in the denial of any article of the Faith.

But this is for others. To yourself, my Lord, I may say, (and you will forgive me for speaking thus plainly,) *the* remedy for secessions from the Church is her own health and well-being. Sickly trees lose their leaves, and cannot ripen the fruit which they have borne. Whatever strengthens and deepens the life of the Church, binds her children to her.

Our Church *is*, by God's mercy, recovering from a deep sickness, the lukewarmness of a miserable century. But all recovery from sickness has suffering. And during sickness, she will have but a weak hold over her children. The token which appeals to people's hearts, is life. For it is the Presence of God. Whatever promotes life, in other words, whatever draws the favour of God, appeals to people's consciences with a force beyond all abstract argument. It alone will draw to her her lost children, as it has drawn them; it alone will retain those who are alarmed for her; it alone will command the respect of those who now disown her, and ignore her very existence. The workings of God's Good Spirit, which now seem so sadly clouded to our eyes by all these exhibitions of human passion and bitterness, have, above all things, kept her children within her. This is the token given, above all others, by our Lord and by His Apostles. The life of the branch is the result of its abiding in the vine. "Falling down he will worship God, and report that God is among you of a truth."

Outward measures will be of use, as far as they promote inward holiness, or hinder aggressions upon the faith. A Supreme Court of Appeal, such as the Church can trust, for the decision of matters of doctrine; the restoration of the Church's legislature to decide upon those questions which yearly

are pressed upon her; guarantees for the rightful appointment to high offices in the Church, that we may not hereafter have other Hoadleys[9] inflicted upon us: these and the like outward measures, or the aiming at them, will re-assure Churchmen that the Church is not about to surrender the Articles of the Faith. And as to inward life, whatsoever tends to recover to the Church the blessed title of being the Church of the poor, the true mother of her children; whatsoever shall make her the true messenger of peace, the converter of the heathen, within or without, "a guide of the blind, a light to them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes;" whatsoever shall make her fulfil better the office of the "messenger of the Lord, to prepare His way before Him," will bind her children to her by love or by awe. Even an Apostle said, "the seal of mine apostleship are even ye in the Lord."

Men's hearts will not fail them, if they see increasing diligence in all these things. But while we have the evils of an uninstructed population, a faith often spoken against, intestine divisions, want of love, irreverence in worship, scoffing at self-denial or earnestness, it is worse than idle to speak of a certain teaching as the cause of these secessions. What teaching ended in the great rent of Wesleyanism? What teaching favoured the loss? Thousands were rent off then, where tens have been rent now.

The politician who raised this storm knew much of the passions of men, but little of their hearts. He has raised a misleading cry, which has been echoed upon platforms by Presbyterians, Independents, Socinians, who exemplify at once their theory of religious liberty, and the duty of the inde-

[9] By "other Hoadleys," I simply meant, "others like Hoadley," who was a Socinian, and long a curse to the English Church. I was not thinking (as a newspaper implies) of any one living. But the intention to "liberalize the Church through the Bishops" has been avowed; and it was ruled in the Queen's Bench, by a casting vote, that no disqualification in one nominated by the Crown to a Bishopric could be legally inquired into, whether as to faith or morals. The nomination then being really in the Prime Minister, there is certainly no legal hindrance to another Hoadley being inflicted on the Church. [Ed. 2.]

pendence of religious and temporal matters, by calling upon the Sovereign to interfere with the faith and practice of the Church to which they do not belong. And this has made men anew tremble for the Church of England, as if the din of these mixed and tumultuous meetings were any sound of the voice of the Church of England. That cry has come in part from undefined fears, in part it comes from those who would desire an amalgamation of Protestantism, by destroying what is the characteristic of the Church of England. Its real aim must be, not men nor their teaching, real or supposed, but the source and guarantee of that teaching, the English Prayer Book. That Prayer Book possesses the hearts of the people, the real people of the Church of England, her devout Communicants, whether among the educated or the village poor. A louder cry would rise up in its defence, not to the earthly Sovereign, but to Him Who would hear, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. The Prayer Book, *as it is*, binds hearts faster to the Church of England than the Episcopate. The very feeling which has now been raised against innovations (whatever they be) would tell with ten-fold force against any mutilation of those services, wherewith their fathers and their fathers' fathers, praised, prayed to, and worshipped God. The Prayer Book, which passed through the furnace of the rebellion, will not be allowed to perish now. God hath delivered the Church "in six troubles," and in Him is our trust that "in seven shall no evil touch" her.

These faithful hearts, my Lord, are the strength of the Church; not the hangers-on upon the Church, nor those who would be her patrons, or her dictators; not those who bear with the Church for the sake of the Establishment, but those who bear with the Establishment for the sake of the nation: not those who speak the loudest, but they who pray the most fervently; not those who are heard in the market-place, but they, the voice of whose heart is heard in Heaven. We shall never get free from secular notions, until it is recognized more distinctly that the true body of the Church are her Communicants. We may be

hopeful of all who do not forsake her services; there is still a band which holds them, which they have not broken; they are children of the Church, as also the Dissenters are her wandering children, and may altogether belong to her. If they communicate not, they may still be held on by some remains of Baptismal grace; they do but faintly belong either to their Lord or to His Church.

But the body of communicants (unless as far as some may have been hurried by this panic, or have given too ready credence to popular fables,) do not raise this clamour. They long only to "worship God in spirit and in truth;" "in the unity of the faith, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." Their voice is not heard amid all this din, because, like their Master, "they do not strive nor cry, neither is their voice heard in the streets." But in them the Church lives now; in them she will live, even if in these last days, sifting times come, and large masses of the nation should, as in France, fall openly from her, or become hostile to her. Through such as these she has ever lived on, in times prosperous or adverse. For God Who bears with all, and "willeth all to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," surely looks with especial favour on those who draw nighest to Him, and seek to be united with Him, that they may dwell in Him and He in them. Through these, as in France now, the Church will spread and enlarge, and absorb into herself those as yet alien from her, while they preach JESUS to them, by their silent devotion, the stillness of their lives, "their[1] faith to Godward," their "work of faith and labours of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ." For through such, even while Apostles preached and worked miracles, did "the word of the Lord sound forth."

And now, my Lord, I trust that this explanation will be satisfactory to your Lordship, and will show that I wished to teach nothing else than what I had learned through the Church of England and her approved Divines. I trust that it may also help to reassure some who are now carried away by this panic. I cannot hope that it will diminish a clamour, whether

[1] 1 Thess. i. 3. 8.

within Parliament or without, in high places or low, which is really directed against the Athanasian Creed, the Baptismal Service, the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, just as much as against any thing which I ever wrote, and against myself chiefly, because I have inculcated what is taught in those formularies. These I cannot satisfy, nor such as will not read what I write, and yet cast out "my name as evil" (as many do) for believing what I do not believe, and for not believing what I do believe [2]. To these I can but give my love and my prayers that God would take away their prejudice and lead them into fuller truth. Nor can I acquiesce in any authority of Parliament in matters of faith or discipline, or of County Meetings, or of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But to "the sacred Synod of this nation in the Name of Christ assembled, the true Church of England by representation," I willingly defer any thing which I have written, being sure that that synod will not deny any portion of "the Faith, once for all delivered to the Saints," and certain also that I never meant to teach any thing but what was so delivered.

In this firm hope and trust, I would venture to use in these dark days the language of one who lived in darker yet, and who has been called "the great Archbishop Bramhall," when he was in exile for the faith of Christ:—

"I do[3] implicitly and in the preparation of my mind submit myself to the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Saints, the 'pillar of truth;' and seeing my adherence is firmer to the infallible rule of Faith, that is, the Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Catholic Church, than

[2] I write this on long experience, and say it not of myself chiefly, but on the ground of numberless tracts, letters, &c., the writers of which seem to have a rooted persuasion that the "High Church" Clergy do not receive what are the first elements of the Gospels, and do receive what they do not. If "Tractarianism" were what it is popularly depicted to be, none would eschew it with more abhorrence than the writers of the Tracts. And yet the very completeness of this misunderstanding makes it the more hopeful that the mists will one day clear and the truth be received.

[3] Pref. to the replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon, p. 22. ed. Oxf.

to mine own private judgment or opinions; although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet this cordial submission is an implicit retractation thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by the Father of mercies, both from me and all others who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace and truth.

"Likewise I submit myself to the representative Church, that is, a free general Council, or so general as can be procured; and until then, to the Church of England, wherein I was baptized, or a national English Synod: to the determination of all which, and each of them respectively, according to the distinct degrees of their authority, I yield a conformity and compliance, or at the least, and to the lowest of them, an acquiescence."

That your Lordship and your brethren, in these perilous times, may "be[4] replenished with the Holy Spirit to the edifying and well-governing of this portion of His Church, and may use the authority given to you, . . . to salvation, . . . and to help; so that, as wise and faithful servants, giving to His family their portion in due season, ye may at last be received into everlasting joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord," is the earnest prayer of your humble and faithful, and (in memory of your fatherly kindness in my early years) grateful servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

CHRIST CHURCH,
2nd Week in Epiphany, 1851.

[4] Prayer in the Service for the Consecration of a Bishop.

"Turn Thee again, O God of Hosts,
Look down from Heaven,
Behold and visit this vine."

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London

937.42
P974

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0068424280

BRITTLE DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

MAR 1 8 1985